This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Transferred to the
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

MISCELLANEA:

COMPRISING

REVIEWS, LECTURES, AND ESSAYS,

ON

HISTORICAL, THEOLOGICAL, AND MISCELLANEOUS SUBJECTS.

TRANSFERRED TO
U OF W LIBRARY

artin ohn

BY M. J. SPALDING, D.D.

BISHOP OF LOUISVILLE.

PROPERTY OF
State Historical Society
OF WISCONSIN,
1876

> Quæcumque in foliis descripsit . . .
> Digerit in numerum, ...
> Ne turbata volent rapidis ludibria ventis.
>
> What time and place disjoin, is here combined,
> Lest sporting winds disperse the flying leaves.—Virgil.

Second Edition,

LOUISVILLE, KY.:
WEBB, GILL, & LEVERING.

1855.

Entered according to an Act of Congress, in the year 1855,
By WEBB, GILL, & LEVERING,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the District of Kentucky.

MORTON & GRISWOLD,
Stereotypers and Printers, Louisville.

TO THE

MOST REVEREND

JOHN BAPTIST PURCELL, D. D.,

Archbishop of Cincinnati,

A DEVOTED CHRISTIAN BISHOP,

AND

A TRUE AMERICAN CITIZEN,

The following Pages are respectfully Inscribed

BY THE AUTHOR.

DG
.S73

PREFACE.

The following pages contain a collection of Reviews, Lectures, and Essays, written during the last ten years. In republishing them in a connected form, with such modifications and corrections as seemed to be called for by change of circumstances, the author has yielded to the urgent solicitations of many partial friends, whose judgment he highly values. In making the selection, he has endeavored to choose in preference those fugitive pieces, the subjects of which appeared to possess more than a merely passing interest.

As the publication progressed, he found that it would be expedient to depart somewhat from the programme of articles, as first issued; changing the order, omitting some, and adding others which were deemed of more importance. The indulgent reader will, he trusts, be satisfied with the change, which will accrue to his benefit in one respect, if in no other,— that the collection now contains nearly one hundred pages of matter additional to what was promised by the publishers. He will also have the goodness to bear in mind, that most of the papers contained in this Volume were written originally for monthly magazines; which will account for the tone which still pervades a few of them, notwithstanding the modifications which have been introduced.

Though an advocate for a plain and straight-forward manner of speaking and writing, as most suitable to the character of our people and the temper of the times, yet, if writing at present, the author would probably adopt a tone considerably different from that which marks some of these Essays. A complete modification of manner could not, however, have been effected, without re-writing them entirely, for which his numerous occupations did not allow him the necessary time. But if he has been plain, and occasionally severe, he hopes due allowance will be made for the aggravating circumstances under which a writer is necessarily placed, who undertakes to defend the Catholic Church from the unscrupulous and wanton assaults, which have been made upon her principles and her members in this country, especially during the last few years. The enemies of our faith can hardly complain, if a portion of their own severity is retorted on them, or if their violent attacks are sometimes made to recoil on their own heads.

In the Introductory Address, written at the suggestion of a distinguished friend, the author undertakes to answer some of the principal charges recently preferred against our Church, by men who, in the hallowed name of liberty, seek to abridge our civil rights in this free republic, and to excite against us a storm of public indignation, if not of open persecution, by a course of reckless misrepresentation. In it, he also takes occasion to refer to many of the Papers contained in this collection, with a view to show how far the subjects therein treated are opportune to the times. It will be seen, that Catholics have no cause to be ashamed either of their religious principles or of their past history; that instead of shrinking from, they court inquiry; and that they have special reason to be proud of the agency of their Catholic ancestors in discovering and colonizing this continent, and in planting thereon, first of all, the banner of the largest civil and religious liberty.

The only motive which prompted the issuing of the present publication has been to do some good, by throwing together, in a permanent form, a considerable number of facts and authorities, gathered from various authentic sources; to which, however, many readers might not have easy access, even if they had the leisure requisite for a satisfactory examination. How far the author has succeeded in carrying out this intention, an impartial and intelligent public will best decide.

CONTENTS.

PREFACE, ... v

INRODUCTORY ADDRESS.

An intolerant spirit invoked against Catholics—Bigotry an implacable monster—The danger of fostering the mob spirit—Features in the present anti-Catholic crusade—Cruel treatment of a Catholic priest—Our adversaries virtually yielding us the victory in fair argument—Their numerous inconsistencies—The Newark outrage—The *manliness* of the American character—Whence danger is to be apprehended to the Republic—The "bats and the eagles"—Hoping for better things—The accusations against us—Is the Catholic Church intolerant?—Or uncharitable?—Latitudinarianism, not charity—Principles of the Church in regard to persecution—Has she ever persecuted as a Church?—Third canon of Lateran—The Inquisition—John Huss—Catholic and Protestant persecution since the reformation—Intolerance in America—Who originated it, and who gave the first example of toleration?—Parallel between Catholic and Protestant countries in the matter of persecution—Are Catholics the enemies of republican government?—What Catholicity and Protestantism have done for human liberty—Charles Carroll of Carrolton—Washington and the Catholics—The temporal power of the Popes—Declarations of Archbishop Carroll and the American Bishops—Letter to the Pope—Are American Catholics a separate community?—Archbishop Carroll and Bishop Dubourg—Foreigners—What they have done for the country—"The foreign vote"—Foreign radicals and infidels—The naturalization laws—The common school system—What the Catholic Church says to her members—Her efforts to promote peace and order—Her charity for all mankind—Archbishop Kenrick's Pastoral. xvii

I. CHURCH HISTORY.—THE EARLY AGES.

Palma and Palmer as historians—Rome and Oxford—Gratuitous assertions—Promises of Christ in favor of the Church—Essential and Non-essential doctrines—Bishop Whittingham—Puseyism—Palmer's division—Purity of early church—The Age of persecution—Donatists—Striking avowal—Peter in Rome—The "Thundering Legion"—*Disciplina arcani*—Testimonies of Saints Ignatius and Justin on Holy Eucharist—Cases of Popes Victor and Stephen—The Primacy—St. Irenæus—The Cross of Constantine—Early heresies—Church of Rome—Story of Liberius and of Honorius I.—Monastic Life—Holy Virginity—Nestorius—St. Cyril of Alexandria—St. Patrick—Early British churches—Primitive Irish churches—St. Simeon Stylites—"Rank Popery"—Early "abuses and corruptions"—Wisdom of the Church—The Seventh and Eighth General Councils. 17

II. CHURCH HISTORY.—THE MIDDLE AGES.

A different division suggested—Triumphs of the Church over barbarism—Missionaries sent by Rome—The Ages of Faith—Auricular Confession—Testimonies of Tertullian and St. Cyprian—Nectarius and the Penitentiary—Puseyite view of the Holy Eucharist—Paschasius Radbert and Berengarius—Temporal authority of the Pope and Bishops—Decretals of Isidore—Prerogatives of the Roman Pontiffs—Pope Julius I.—Greek Schism—Order of pre-eminence—Michael Cerularius—Shaving the beard—The Nicene Canons—Edifying incident of St. Anselm—Modern Anglican parsons—Vision of "Roman attempts at usurpation"—Have the promises of Christ failed?—The Roman Primacy acknowledged by the early Greek Church—And at Councils of Lyons and Florence—When was the doctrine of the Primacy defined?—Purgatory—Transubstantiation—Indulgences—Protestant *Indulgences*—Penitential works—Repudiating the debt—The Rosary—"The pure and holy One"—Temporal power of the Pope—Its influence on civilization. 87

III. CHURCH HISTORY.—SINCE THE REFORMATION

Necessity of calm impartiality—Protestant and Catholic views of Reformation—Wickliffe and Huss—Oriental languages—Foreign and British reformation—Luther and Carlostadt—Curious anachronism—Luther and Episcopacy—Anglican branch of the reformation—"Scruples of Henry VIII."—The new Gospel light—The Anglican Pope—Royal prerogative predominant—Cromwell Vicar

General—Base servility of first Anglican Bishops—Fisher and Moore—Burning Protestants and Catholics—Palmer's theory of Anglican reformation examined—Downright tyranny—Trait of noble independence—Edward VI.—Married clergy—*Improvements* of Anglican liturgy—Return to unity under Mary—Bull of St. Pius V.—Henry's divorce—Reformation in Ireland—How the Anglican church was *persecuted* in Ireland—Dr. Lingard's testimony and proofs—Anglican saints—Ridley—Macaulay's portrait of Cranmer—A parallel—Infidelity of Protestant origin—Anglican infidels—Suppression of Anglican convocation—Church and state—Where Voltaire learned infidelity—Infidels in Protestant Europe—French clergy during the Revolution—Did the French Revolution make any *Protestant* martyrs?—Conclusion, ... 57

IV. LITERATURE AND THE ARTS IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

Importance of the subject—Writers who have treated it—Division—A Colossus falling—Incursions of the Northmen—A deluge—Beautiful Italy—Awful devastation—New dynasties—Christianity triumphant over barbarism—Civilization—Literary history—Tenth century—Gradual revival—Its causes—Golden age of Leo X.—Latin language in liturgy—And the Monastic institute—Elevation of woman—Modern languages—And poetry—Paper—Art of Printing—Illuminated manuscripts—Universities—Schools of Law and Medicine—Musical Notes—Organs—Bells—Mariner's compass—Geographical discoveries—Commerce—First Bank—Post Office—Newspapers—Spectacles—Gunpowder—Stone coal—Arithmetical numbers—Algebra—Glass—Stained Glass—Agriculture—Botany—Clocks—Painting revived—Silk introduced—Gothic style of Architecture—Leaning tower of Pisa—Conclusion, ... 77

V. LITERATURE AND THE CATHOLIC CLERGY.—LIBRARIES.

Modern history unfair—A great conspiracy against the truth—Whence this unfairness in English writers—Robbery and sacrilege—Origin of modern mammonism—Persecution of slander—What Protestants have said in favor of the Monks—Leibnitz—Ellendorf—Edmund Burke—Raising up the lowly—Giving asylum to the oppressed—Bishop Tanner—Mallet—Drake—Sharon Turner—Bates—Quarterly Review—Origin of Libraries—Ancient Christian Libraries—Cathedral and Monastic Libraries—Monks transcribing books—And collecting them into Libraries—Care of books enjoined by rule—Zeal of Monks in saving books—Principal monastic collections of Manuscripts—Scarcity of books—Agency of the Universities—Religious women engaged as copyists—Writing with golden and silver ink—Illuminated margins—The *Scriptorium*—Means of augmenting Libraries—Encouragement afforded by Roman Pontiffs—What we owe to patient Monastic labor—Summary of what the Clergy and Monks have done for Literature, ... 96

VI. SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE "DARK" AGES.

Protestant boasting—Light and darkness—Revival of letters and the Reformation—Early and recent persecution of slander compared—Gibbon—Protestant theory—Lame argument—Early Christian Schools—Plato and Aristotle—Irish Schools—And Irish Scholars—Cathedral Schools—Charlemagne and Alfred—Councils ordering the erection of Schools—The Monasteries—And monastic Schools—What was therein taught—Schools for the nobility—Signing in cipher—Female Academies—Literary ladies—Universities—In Italy—England—And France—Statement of Danielo examined—Curious incident in the history of the University of Paris—Three qualities of mediæval Schools and Universities stated and established—Who first founded Free Schools?—Glance at modern Universities. 113

VII. INFLUENCE OF CATHOLICITY ON CIVIL LIBERTY.

Terms defined—What is liberty?—Which is the best form of government?—Direct and indirect influence—Tendency of Christian teaching—Division of the subject—Theoretical view—Equalizing the social condition—Form of Church government—A happy blending of different elements—The elective principle—Deliberative assemblies—Authority of the Pope—Practical influence of the Church—In the early ages—In the middle ages—Rescuing Europe from barbarism—Means employed for humanizing society—Two Protestant testimonies—Slavery and the serf system—Struggle between the Cross and the Crescent—The Crusades—Their influence on the social condition—The Free Cities—In Spain—In Germany—And in Italy—Lombard League—Italian Republics—Guelphs and Ghibellines—The deposing power—Republics of San Marino and Andorra—The monastic institute—Teaching of mediæval theologians—*Magna Charta*—William Wallace, Robert Bruce, and William Tell—Influence of the reformation on liberty—In Germany—And in England—Catholic patriots during the American revolution—Conclusion, . . . 131

VIII. AGE OF POPE GREGORY VII.—THE DEPOSING POWER.

Importance of the subject—Society struggling into form—Hildebrand—His cotemporaries—Historical portraits and parallels—Napoleon's opinion of Gregory VII.—How the Pontiff has been attacked by his enemies—And how defended by Voigt—The great idea of Gregory—His relations to society as its spiritual head—A torrent of abuse stemmed—The question of investitures—Ancient mode of nominating to bishoprics—Contest between the Popes and the emperors of Germany—Papal election—A vital question—St. Peter Damian—His relations to Gregory—Simony and disorder among the clergy—Hildebrand unanimously elected Pope—His earlier career—His experience, coolness, and wisdom—Not exceedingly stern—His wonderful activity—His correspondence—His moral courage—His temporal relations to society—Distracted state of Europe—Princes swearing fealty to the Pope—His protectorate recognised and invoked—Gregory not ambitious—His long struggle with Henry IV.—The Nero of the twelfth century—Otto of Nordheim—Summary of the whole contest—Moderation of Gregory—How and why the Pontiff declared Henry deposed—A stroke for liberty—Opinion of Voigt, - - - - - - - - - - - - - 151

IX. THE GREAT SCHISM OF THE WEST.—ROME AND AVIGNON.

The Reformers before the Reformation—Bonnechose and D'Aubignè compared—The former as an historian—Is he ingenuous or fair?—Inaccuracies—Scope of his work—The Schism a fiery ordeal for the Church—From which she came forth unscathed—Scandals to be expected—Morality of the Popes—Origin of the Schism—The papacy "stooping to conquer"—Contest between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair—The death of Boniface and election of his successor—Intrigues of Philip—The Popes reside at Avignon—Their policy—Return to Rome—Election of Urban VI.—Defection of Cardinals—They set up Clement VII.—Who moves to Avignon—Political ambition of princes—The evil and the remedy come from France—University of Paris—Council of Pisa—And of Constance—Election of Martin V.—End of the Schism—Remarks—Triumph of the Church—Relation of the Pope to a general council—Reforming the Church "in its head and members"—The succession not interrupted—Two objections answered—Church emerged from the Schism stronger than ever—And so did the papacy, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 169

X. JOHN HUSS AND THE HUSSITES.—THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

New trials lead to new triumphs of the Church—Character of John Huss—A traitor in the camp—Seeking popularity—Wickliffe and his doctrines—These necessarily lead to civil commotions—Translated into Bohemia—University of Prague—The German and Bohemian students—Carthagenian hatred of Rome—Writers on Huss and his disciples—Persecution no Catholic tenet—Imperial laws on the subject—What were the doctrines of Huss?—And what their influence on society?—What means did he adopt to spread them?—Was he consistent?—Had he a fair trial at Constance?—Was the council cruel towards him?—Were the fathers guilty of breach of faith?—Keeping faith with heretics—Case of Jerome of Prague—Horrible excesses of the Hussites—Ziska "of the Cup"—Pillage, murder, and sacrilege—A horrid martial instrument of music—A dark and bloody monument to the memory of Huss, - - - - - - - - - - - 191

XI. THE SPANISH INQUISITION.—PRESCOTT'S VIEW.

Interest of Spanish history—Evils arising from the French revolution—Can Spain become Protestant?—Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella—His character as an historian—His prejudices—His authorities on the Spanish Inquisition—Who was Limborch?—His reliability—Character of Llorente—Writers on the other side—Prescott's view—His statements examined—Three propositions established—Was the Spanish Inquisition a religious or a political institution?—Its origin traced—A parallel case—Remarkable testimony of Rankè—The alleged cruelties of the Inquisition—Are they exaggerated?—Authority of Voltaire—Of Bourgoing—And of Limborch—The civil and ecclesiastical courts—"Justice and Mercy"—Mode of procedure—Motive for secresy—Torture—Jurisprudence of the time—In what court was the final decision given?—Count Polnitz—English and Genevan Inquisition—Was counsel allowed the accused?—Is the Catholic Church responsible for the Spanish Inquisition?—Agency of the Roman Pontiffs—Their efforts to restrain cruelty—The Portuguese Inquisition, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 212

XII. THE REFORMATION IN SWITZERLAND.—BERNESE INTRIGUES.

The late religious war in Switzerland—Policy of France and Austria—Intrigues of England—Character of the war—Whence the liberties of Switzerland—Analogy between the late struggle, and that preceding the Reformation—Berne the center of operations—M. de Haller's point of view—

His character as an historian—His authorities—Wavering of Berne—Tortuous policy—How she embraced the Reform—The *bear* and the *pears*—Treacherous perjury of Berne—Zwinglian Council—Its decrees—Religious liberty crushed—Riot and sacrilege—Proceedings of Bernese commissioners—Downright tyranny—The minister Farel—His *fiery* zeal—An appalling picture—A parallel—Priests hunted down—Character of the ministers—Avowal of Capito—The glorious privilege of private judgment—How consistent!—Persecution of brother Protestants—Drowning the Anabaptists—Reformation in Geneva—Rapid summary of horrors—The Bernese army of invasion—The sword and the Bible—Forbearance of Catholics—Affecting incident at Soleure—The war of Cappell—Points of resemblance—An *armed* apostle—A prophet quailing before danger—Battle of Cappell—Death of Zwingle—Triumph of Catholic cantons—Treaty of Peace, - - - - - - 224

XIII. PRESCOTT'S CONQUEST OF MEXICO.

Article I.—Character of the Conquerors.

Prescott as an historian—Compared with other American writers—His style and manner—Qualities essential to an historian—Prescott's research—His authorities—His accuracy—His impartiality—His religious prejudices—The ghost of the Inquisition haunts him—His gross charges against the Catholic Church—His enthusiasm awakened—Romantic character of the conquest—Rapid sketch of its history—Character of the conquerors—Hernando Cortes—Compared with ancient generals—Was the conquest justifiable?—Principles and facts bearing on this question—Horrid human sacrifices among the Aztecs—The Spaniards and the Puritans compared—Were the conquerors wantonly cruel? Facts and specifications alleged and explained—Palliating circumstances—Seizure of Montezuma—And execution of Guatamozin—Prescott's testimony—Spanish conquest of Mexico and English conquest of India compared—Cortes and Lord Clive—Macaulay, - - - - 250

XIV. PRESCOTT'S CONQUEST OF MEXICO.

Article II.—The Religious Point of View of the Conquest.

Religious point of view necessary—Noble sentiment of Lope de Vega—Spaniards much influenced by it—Prescott's testimony—The Spanish cavalier, a soldier of the Cross—Injustice done his character by Prescott—The age of chivalry compared with the present—Motives which actuated Catholic and Protestant navigators and pioneers—A holy Crusade—Religious character of Cortes—His standard—Stirring address to his soldiers—The Cross unfurled—And animating the army—Zeal for the conversion of the natives—Religious rites and worship—Relative adaptation of Catholic and Protestant systems for making proselytes—Prescott's theory examined—Remarkable incidents showing the piety of the conquerors—Their zeal sometimes too fiery—Catholic missionaries—They oppose cruelty to the natives—As well as all forced conversions—Las Casas and Olmedo—Alleged intemperate zeal of Cortes—Idols cast down—Explanation and defense—Charitable zeal of Olmedo—Aquilar and other missionaries—Religious ceremonies on launching the fleet—And at the termination of the siege—Missionaries after the Conquest—Destruction of the Teocallis—Great number of converts among the Aztecs—How accounted for—Prescott's theory—"The Aztec worship and Romish ritual!"—Alleged similarity between the two—Curious coincidences—Alleged miracles—Loss and gain to the Church—Conclusion, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 275

XV. EARLY CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN THE NORTH WEST.

First Paper.—Bancroft's Account.

Bancroft as an historian—An old *Relation*—Catholic missionary zeal—Spirit of Catholic and Protestant colonists compared—Who established the first missions in North America?—The Franciscans and Jesuits—The first Jesuit missionaries—The first college—And the first hospital—The Ursulines in Canada—The mission to the Hurons—Fathers De Brebeuf and Daniel—Their manner of life—The chief Ahasistari—Mission to the Algonquins—And to the Chippewas—"The New England Elliott"—Father Jogues—And Father Bressani—Mission among the Abenakis—Mohawks—Onondagas—And Cayugas—Extent of the missions—Penetrating westward—Father Marquette—His death—Subsequent history of the Jesuit missions—Policy of England, - - - 298

XVI. EARLY CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN THE NORTH WEST.

Second Paper.—The Huron Mission.

A beautiful spectacle—Reclaiming the savage—Details of the Mission among the Hurons—The nation of Christians—An Indian council—A touching incident—A picture of primitive fervor—Edifying anecdotes—Triumphs of grace—Attack of the Huron villages—Father Daniel—His glorious mar-

tyrdom—His virtues—Another attack by the Iroquois—Heroic conduct of Fathers de Brebeuf and Lallement—They are made prisoners—Devotedness of their neophytes—The glories of the Huron Mission scattered. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 311

XVII. EARLY CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN THE NORTH WEST.

Third Paper—Fathers De Brebeuf and Lallement.

Martyrdom of Fathers de Brebeuf and Lallement—Their remains solemnly interred—Their heroism—Details of their martyrdom—Horrible cruelties—Life of Father Lallement—His reasons for devoting himself to the Indian missions—The Aloysius of the Huron missions—And the Xavier—Father John De Brebeuf—Sketch of his life—His first attempt to found the Huron mission—His ardent zeal—And spirit of prayer—His love of the cross—He pants for martyrdom—His difficulties and sufferings among the Hurons—He is exposed to imminent danger of his life—His humility—His unceasing labors—His calmness—And noble courage—The results of his zeal—The Apostle of the Hurons, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 322

XVIII. WEBSTER'S BUNKER HILL SPEECH.

Relative Treatment of the American Aborigines by the English and Spanish Colonists.

Mr. Webster as an orator—Compared with Preston, Calhoun, and Clay—Mr. Webster's omissions—His drift—A sound principle—But inconclusive reasoning—Different policy adopted by English and Spanish colonists—"The Anglo Saxon blood"—A parallel case—Cause of aversion to Spain—The reformation of Luther—Its influence on liberty—"The middle class"—Luther and the peasants—Protestant opinions—Religious element in Spanish colonization—Irving's testimony—Portuguese colonists—Catholic and Protestant navigators—Who introduced slavery?—Alleged cruelties of the Spaniards—Las Casas—Cruelties practised by the Puritans—Their treatment of the Aborigines—The Pokanokets—Shrewd bargaining—King Philip—The Narragansetts—Their extermination—The Pequods—"The godly Stone"—A horrible conflagration—Settling accounts—"A dark shade on the soil of Massachusetts," - - - - - - - - - - - - - 333

XIX. OUR COLONIAL BLUE LAWS.

Article I.—Union of Church and State.

Why we treat this subject—Who are, and who have been the persecutors?—Meaning of the term *Blue Laws*—Effort at concealment—Bancroft's reserve—Other historians of New England—Character of the Puritans—Their good and their bad qualities—Their treatment of the Aborigines—Their inconsistency—Two classes of Blue Laws—Union of Church and State—Conformity—The franchise—Established religion—Observance of the Sabbath—Severe enactments—Law against priests—Spirit of persecution in New York—Miscellaneous laws—Indians and wolves—Use of tobacco—Manner of dress—Cut of the hair—Matrimony—And divorce—By whom were the Blue Laws repealed?—Some Blue Laws of Virginia—The land of "steady habits"—Catholic Colony of Maryland, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 353

XX. OUR COLONIAL BLUE LAWS.

Article II.—Heretics, Quakers, and Witches.

Two characteristics of the Puritans—Scenting out heresy and witchcraft—Preaching and practice—Consistency—Which colony deserves the palm—Roger Williams—His principles and banishment—Laws against Quakers—How executed—A strong protest—How answered—Persecution avowed and proved from the Bible—Witchcraft in New England—Why so prevalent there—Exposition of Cotton Mather—Shrewdness of the witches—How they were exterminated—"Eight firebrands of hell" Hanging first, and trying afterwards—Humorous passage from Irving, - - - 369

XXI. THE SPIRIT OF THE AGE.

Temporal and Eternal.

Is this an enlightened age?—Enlightenment and empiricism—Material progress—Constant agitation and fever—Rest and motion—Self-complacency—Two classes of extravagance pointed out—And illustrated—Doctrine of progress applied to religion—Degrading religion to an earthly standard—

Reason and faith—Incident related by St. Augustine—Reasoning backwards—A tower of Babel—Modern systems of philosophy—True and false liberty—Evils growing out of sectarianism—Carrying out a false principle—Private judgment—The great struggle and its final issue—Protestantism and enlightenment—American infidelity—Parallel lines of reasoning adopted by the sects and by infidels—Fanaticism and infidelity—Mammonism—Money and virtue—Mammon worship in churches—Utilitarianism—Wrong views of education—Religious indifference and latitudinarianism—Frightful moral disorders—Fruits of Protestantism—The great problem of the age, - 363

XXII. THE CHARGE OF IDOLATRY.

Honor and Invocation of Saints.

The curve and the straight line—The issue of the Puseyite movement—Its benefits—Origin of the controversy concerning Idolatry in the Catholic Church—Palmer and Dr. Wiseman—Charge by the former—How met by the latter—Palmer's criterion applied against himself—His line of reasoning unfair—Three propositions laid down—And proved—Catholic doctrine stated—Testimony by the Council of Trent—The Missal and the Breviary—Why are the Saints honored and invoked?—Passage from the late Pope's encyclical letter explained—Guardian angels—Objected passages explain themselves—Prayer of Cardinal Bona—Incident in the life of St. Alphonsus Liguori—St. Francis di Girolamo—The Pope's encyclical again—Palmer's Italics—The climax of idolatry—Coldness and enthusiasm in devotion—The devotion to the Virgin—Beautiful passage of Dr. Wiseman—Possible abuse no argument—Palmer's inconsistency—Passages from the ancient fathers—How he explains them—His glaring perversion of authorities—His work of supererogation—Faith and practice of the early Church—Beauty and sublimity of the Catholic doctrine—Devotion to the Virgin—A golden chain, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 397

XXIII. THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF SATISFACTION.

Faith and Works.

Harmony of Catholic doctrines—Their scope and influence—The great Physician—His religion medicinal—The doctrine of Satisfaction intimately connected with that of the Atonement—Standing at the foot of the cross—The center of the religious system—Source of light and heat—The Atonement sufficient—And made for all—Our co-operation necessary for its application to us—Denying ourselves and entering into the sacrificial spirit of Christ—Scriptural proofs—Practice of the saints—Motive for corporal austerities—The cross ever present to the Christian mind—The sacrifice of the altar and that of the Cross—Protestant view of the Atonement—Faith and works—Halting half way—The more *comfortable* and the *safer* way—Caustic passage of Tertullian—Two roads to heaven—Palmer's view—His arguments superficial and captious—Temporal punishment for sin already forgiven—Scriptural examples—Palmer's explanation of them refuted—His paltry quibbling—Charge of absurdity answered—Reasons for the temporal penalty remaining—Palmer grows pathetic—Troubling the peace of consciences—Unearthly character of the doctrine—The blessings it has produced, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 418

XXIV. THE CONFESSIONAL.

Tactics of its Enemies.

Strong presumptive evidence of Catholicity—The proud position of the Church—Phases of the warfare against her—Appeal to passion against truth—Luther's tactics—Those of other reformers similar—Protestant and infidel arguments against Catholicity compared—The vilest of all the modes of attack—Closing the church against ladies—Books teeming with obscenity—A burning shame for Christian ministers—Sympathy with infidels—Who was Michelet?—An amusing incident—Translator of Michelet—A horrid picture of woman—Mohammedanism revived—Methodist camp-meetings—A "female Jesuit"—"Incarnation of Satan"—Transcendentalism—A rare consolation!—"French bulls"—Inconsistency and contradiction—Michelet as an historian and logician—His premises false—And his reasoning illogical—Blindness of bigotry—The serpent in paradise—A portrait—"The end justifies the means"—Great honor to the Church—The beams and the mote—The confessional considered by the light of experience—A palpable absurdity—A gross libel upon the sex—Course adopted by the Protestant preachers—Extracts from our theologians—Parallel cases—"Whipping hypocrisy"—Whence all the clamor against the Confessional—Did the priests introduce it?—What motive could they have had?—Was it possible to make the change?—The question of innovation tested—History appealed to—Prescription—Our Saviour and the Pharisees, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 436

XXV. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.

Article I.—England and France—Holland and Belgium.

Influence of Catholicity and Protestantism on material interests—Current theory—The argument wholly inconclusive—And the facts assumed, but not proved—England's prosperity—How explained—Rise and decline of Catholic powers—Why God permits the wicked to prosper—Masses of England's population—Catholic Ireland—England and France compared—In which is the bulk of the people more comfortable?—Laing's argument—French and English honesty and politeness—Holland and Belgium compared—Belgian railroads—Charity in Catholic and Protestant countries—Condition of the poor—Relative prosperity of the Catholic and Protestant population of Prussia—The serf system—How long it lingered in Protestant countries—Who have been the best friends and champions of the poor and oppressed? 455

XXVI CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.

Article II.—Germany and Italy.

The Catholic and Protestant cantons of Switzerland—An "enlightened self-interest"—Why the Protestant cantons are more prosperous—Material condition of Catholic Italy—Italian and Scotch holy days—Mr. Laing's theory for explaining the alleged social inferiority of the Italians—Italy in ancient and modern times—Influence of climate on popular industry and activity—The Italian poor compared with those of England and Ireland—Mr. Laing's testimony—The garden-like culture of Italy—Comparative cheerfulness of Protestant and Catholic nations—Taste for the fine arts—Politeness—Temperance—Testimony of Robert Dale Owen—Comparative morality—Moral condition of Sweden—Popular education in Catholic and Protestant countries—The common school system in Austria—Liberal policy—Relative instruction of English and Belgian operatives—The Prussian common school system—Religious condition—State of religion at Geneva—Deplorable defection—Protestantism in other European countries—Mr. Laing's theory to account for the admitted religious superiority of Catholic nations examined—His honorable testimony to Catholic faith and piety, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 472

XXVII. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.

Article III.—England, as she is and was.

English boasting—What is the condition of her people?—Has her greatness elevated the masses of her population?—A land of social contrasts—English pauperism a crime—Frightful condition of English operatives—Summary of evidence on the subject—How England relieves her poor—The work houses—The dying pauper—Testimony of Dr. Southey—No liberty for the poor in England—Immorality of London—The Anglican establishment—England evangelizing the world!—The English aristocracy—Brougham on English taxation—Mammonism in England and America—Portrait of Daniel O'Connell, ... 493

XXVIII. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.

Article IV.—Ireland and the Irish.

The great day of reckoning—An historical parallel—Ireland still unconquered—Un-American feeling of hostility to foreigners—Are we really independent of England?—Political nativism—What have foreigners done for the country?—Why Irishmen are hated—The Irish character—Its lights and shades—English treatment of Ireland—The first period of Ireland's sufferings—Protestant evidence—The second period—The reformation in Ireland—Irish fidelity to the ancient faith—Policy of Elizabeth and the Stuarts—Wholesale confiscation and butchery—The men of 1782—The Union—Protestant ascendency—Emancipation, ... 506

XXIX. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.

Article V.—Italian Society.

Dickens and Kip—Superficial travelers—Writing for money—Lady tourists—License for gossiping—Character of Dickens as a writer—Baretti and Sharp—Italian contentment—Two extremes to be avoided in the social condition—Material comforts—Difference between the Italians and Americans—Laboring classes in Italy—Italian squalor—Mode of life among Italians—Their sprightliness—

Vivacity of children—Italians a social people—Their amusements—Gambling—Horse races among them and us compared—Profane swearing—Temperance—General use of wine—Its effects on temperance and health—Politeness—Meekness among the great—Training of children in Italy—A gross charge against Italian morality refuted—The fashion of employing *Cavalieri Serventi*—How it originated, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 523

XXX. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.

Article VI.—Brazil and the Brazilians.

Interest of the subject—Qualifications for an impartial traveler—Misrepresenting Catholic doctrines and practices—Missionary tourists—Mr. Kidder's misstatements—The Brazilians *adoring* images—Absurd blunders—Fire-works on the "Sabbath"—Service of the holy week—Decoration of Brazilian churches—Religious emblems and names—Our Lady of the Snow—Homicides in Brazil and among us—Distributing tracts—A bright youth—The Bible in Brazil—Extracts from it read in the public schools—"The Bible never proscribed in Brazil"—Inquisitorial censorship—A trick of the Bible society—The Brazilians liberal and tolerant—The Catholic clergy—Slavery in Brazil—Touching practices of piety among the slaves—The religious Brotherhoods—The charity hospital at Rio—Is there any native party in Brazil?—Failure of Mr. Kidder's mission—His return home—Advantages of clerical celibacy, - - - - - - - - - - - - - 538

XXXI. THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

Dr. Durbin's Observations in the East.

The present struggle in the East—The ancient Episcopal Sees—Alexandria—Antioch—Jerusalem—Constantinople—Statistics of the eastern and western churches in the early ages—Ancient glory and present degradation of the Oriental Churches—A picture of desolation—A vast necropolis—Decrease of population—Testimonies of Dr. Frankland and Dr. Durbin—Number of Christians in the Turkish empire—Chastisement inflicted on the Greek schismatics—Their present forlorn condition—The only hope for their restoration—Their discipline in regard to the celibacy of the clergy—Their acknowledged agreement in doctrine with the Roman Catholics—Argument founded thereon in favor of the Catholic Church—Protestant missionaries in the East—Have they succeeded?—Dr. Durbin's admissions—His omissions supplied in regard to the Protestant missions of Hasbeja and Oroomiah—Disunion among the Protestant missionaries—Catholic missions in the East—Dr. Durbin's candid avowal—Statistics—The seven Apocalyptic churches—The church of Philadelphia—Downright popery—Christian charity recommended, - - - - - - - - - - 554

XXXII. ROME,

As seen by a New Yorker.

New York and Rome—Superficial books—Candid avowal—Inaccuracies—Colonnade in front of Saint Peter's—The ball on the dome—St. Mary Major's—Popes preserving ancient monuments—Italian *Ciceroni*—Tricks on travelers—"The lynx-eyed sculptor"—Laughable mistakes—The Jews in Rome—The chair of St. Peter—Religious services in the Colisseum—Rome not sufficiently progressive—Picture of Rome as the capital of Christendom—Artistic genius of Italy—Liberality towards foreign artists—Overbeck—Paintings in churches—Roman churches never closed against worshipers—Roman charity—Beggars—Italian wines—Valuable suggestion—Italian monks—The Vatican—Villa Borghese—Education in Rome—Pope Gregory XVI.—The college of cardinals—General impression made by Rome on our New Yorker, - - - - - - - - - - - 570

XXXIII. THE PAPAL GOVERNMENT.

The late Roman revolution—Character of Pius IX.—His measures of reform—How received by his subjects—Base ingratitude—Assassination of Rossi and Palma—A reign of terror—Zambianchi and his band of assassins—Mazzini and his idea of liberty—Europe indignant—The Pontiff restored by the Catholic powers—Whose fault was it that Pius IX. did not succeed in effecting political reform?—Monarchy and mob rule—Origin of the papal states—Did the Popes usurp temporal dominion?—Advantages of their being independent sovereigns—Mr. Headley's Outline Sketch—Statistics of the papal territory—The government an elective monarchy—How the administration is conducted—Mr. Headley's mistakes and omissions—Board to redress grievances—The Sacra Consulta—Municipal regulations—Opinion of Lunadoro—The Sacra Ruota—An incident—The advocate of the poor—Charitable and educational institutions cherished by the Papal Government, - 585

XXXIV. THE PHILADELPHIA RIOTS.

The Native American Party.

Dreadful scenes—Will they occur again?—Signs of the times—*Accident* and *choice*—Fearless Protestant writers—Letter to Mayor Harper—Remote causes of the Riots—Union of hatred—What Catholicity has done for liberty and civilization—And what for this country—Real and nominal freedom—Forecast of Thomas Jefferson—His opinion—Glance at the history of bigotry in the United States—Burning of the Ursuline convent—Rev. Lyman Beecher—And other Protestant ministers—Maria Monk—The Protestant Association—A picture of its spirit and proceedings drawn by a Protestant—Immediate causes of the Riots—Native Americans—"Spare the Bible"—Doings of the party—A slander refuted—True State of the case—*Ex parte* evidence—Attempt to evade responsibility—Agency of the Protestant ministers—Burke's estimate of the Catholic clergy—Address to the Protestant community—And to the Catholics—The Church indestructible, - 596

XXXV. A CHAPTER ON MOBS,

Ancient and Modern.

Can Mobs put down truth and virtue?—Nothing new under the sun—Historical retrospect—Past trials and triumphs of the Church—The first Mob crucified Christ—The second stoned St. Stephen—Mobs during the first three centuries—Nero the first instigator of them—Mobs a principal feature in the early persecutions—How they were gotten up—Persecution of slander—Forgery—Early Christians branded as aliens and traitors—Tertullian's pointed sarcasm—Mob spirit contagious—The great Roman Mob under Diocletian—St. Basil's graphic description—Sepulchral monument to Christianity—Fate of the persecutors—Mobs powerless—The Cross triumphant—Unalterable meekness of early Christians under persecution—Mobs since the reformation—Are they not similar in spirit to those directed against Christianity during the first three centuries?—A parting word to American Catholics, - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 619

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS.

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS,

To the Impartial Public;

ON THE INTOLERANT SPIRIT OF THE TIMES.

An intolerant spirit invoked against Catholics—Bigotry an implacable monster—The danger of fostering the mob spirit—Features in the present anti-Catholic crusade—Cruel treatment of a Catholic priest—Our adversaries virtually yielding us the victory in fair argument—Their numerous inconsistencies—The Newark outrage—The *manliness* of the American character—Whence danger is to be apprehended to the Republic—The "bats and the eagles"—Hoping for better things—The accusations against us—Is the Catholic Church intolerant?—Or uncharitable?—Latitudinarianism, not charity—Principles of the Church in regard to persecution—Has she ever persecuted as a Church?—Third canon of Lateran—The Inquisition—John Huss—Catholic and Protestant persecution since the reformation—Intolerance in America—Who originated it, and who gave the first example of toleration?—Parallel between Catholic and Protestant countries in the matter of persecution— Are Catholics the enemies of republican government?—What Catholicity and Protestantism have done for human liberty—Charles Carroll of Carrolton—Washington and the Catholics—The temporal power of the Popes—Declarations of Archbishop Carroll and the American Bishops—Letter to the Pope—Are American Catholics a separate community?—Archbishop Carroll and Bishop Dubourg—Foreigners—What they have done for the country—"The foreign vote"—Foreign radicals and infidels—The naturalization laws—The common school system—What the Catholic Church says to her members—Her efforts to promote peace and order—Her charity *for* all mankind—Archbishop Kenrick's Pastoral.

THAT a fierce spirit of intolerance has been lately evoked in this once free country, no candid observer of passing events will deny. Christians of a particular denomination have been selected, as its first victims; but no one who has studied human nature, as it is developed in the facts of history, will for a moment suppose, that the ruin of Catholics in this country will satisfy the cravings of this fierce Moloch of religious bigotry. As with the tiger, the taste of blood will but sharpen its appetite for new victims. So it has been in the past; so it will be in the future.

Let no one deceive himself, nor suffer himself to be deceived, in a matter of so vital an importance to all who are sheltered under the glorious flag of our union. Once the barriers, which our noble constitution throws around the civil and religious liberties of all citizens alike, are broken down, no matter under what pretext of excitement, of political expediency, or necessity, there is no telling where the spirit of innovation will stop, or where the evils consequent upon it will be arrested. When a torrent has once broken through the embankment along its margin, it spreads devastation through the entire country; and the husbandman who has neglected the necessary precautions, while it was yet time, finds out, when it is too late for remedy, that all the fruits of his patient toil have been swept away or destroyed by the raging waters. So it will be precisely, should the checks and balances, which the wisdom and forecast of our fathers have inserted in the constitution, be neglected or set at naught. The torrent of human passions, once it has overleaped this barrier, will overwhelm our beautiful country with ruins. All our dearly bought liberties will be virtually destroyed; property will be no longer secure; law and order will give place to passion and mob violence; the dearest of all human rights and privileges,— that of worshiping God according to the dictates of our conscience,— will be annihilated; the beautiful earthly paradise of our happy republic will be changed into a frowning wilderness, filled with horror and desolation: finally, anarchy will take the place of order and good government. The worst possible species of tyranny is that of the mob. Far better be oppressed by one tyrant, than be crushed and torn by a thousand: far better have even a Nero or a Diocletian to lord it over you, than be ruled by that hydra-headed monster, called a *mob*. The solitary tyrant may have some misgivings, or retain some remnant of justice or humanity; he may at least be checked by a sense of personal responsibility, and may tremble on his throne at the fear of popular retribution: the many-headed despot has neither reason, nor justice, nor humanity, nor conscience, nor fear of God or man, to restrain him from deeds of violence.

For the truth of this picture, we appeal with confidence to all history; from the period when an excited mob cried out against the Blessed Jesus at the tribunal of Pilate: — Crucify Him! crucify Him!! — down to the other day, when another mob, composed of persons calling themselves *Christians*, raised fiendish shouts of triumph at the tearing down and trampling under foot of the Cross, which had ornamented the spire of a Catholic Church in Chelsea! At every time and in every place, the mob has always been the same ruthless, savage, untameable monster; the Christian scarcely less so than the pagan.[1]

Unhappily, we need not go far back into times past, nor travel far from home, to witness the sad effects of mob violence. A distinctive feature in the present crusade against Catholics in this country, is precisely the invoking against them of this ruthless spirit. Five or six of our churches either burnt, or sacked, or blown up by gunpowder,— most of them while our citizens were engaged in the joyous celebration of the liberty-hallowed Fourth of July; — street brawlers, generally men of the lowest and most infamous character, hired to vilify and slander us and all that we hold most dear and sacred in the public streets and highways, thereby openly exciting the passions of the ignorant to bloody civil feuds; our people, after having been thus grievously wronged in their character as citizens and as religionists, butchered in brutal street encounters, or assassinated in detail,[1] and then almost invariably placed in the wrong by a mendacious press and telegraph, in the interest of their enemies; and the victims of all these cruel and accumulated wrongs generally receiving, instead of sympathy, but additional obloquy and persecution, they being in almost every instance the only ones arrested and punished for the riots which others had caused, while the murderers and assassins and church burners escape:—these are some of the practical workings of that truculent spirit, which, during the present year, has been aroused against us in this *free* country!

---

[1] For more on this subject, we refer to the Chapter on Mobs, in this Volume, p. 619, seqq., and to the Article on the Philadelphia Riots, p. 596, seqq.

Every one knows how a Catholic priest—the Rev. Mr. Bapst—was lately treated by a savage mob at Ellsworth in Maine. He was universally conceded to be a man of great zeal and benevolence, as well as of irreproachable life. The only crime alleged against him, was that he had dared express an opinion on the Common School System, different from that of the majority. For this, in pursuance of a resolution passed at a town meeting, he was tarred and feathered, ridden on a rail, and treated with indignities, which forcibly remind us of the scenes on Calvary; indignities of which savages should have been ashamed. The ruffians, amidst these horrible outrages to God's minister, did not, however, forget to rifle his pockets and to appropriate to themselves his watch and money![2] Says the Bangor Journal—a secular print of the vicinity:

> "While the tarring and feathering was going on, he was mocked and reviled with horrid blasphemies and indecencies. He was asked why he came over to this country. To preach the Catholic doctrine, he replied. We are Protestants, the ruffians said, and will teach you better than that. One, mocking him, said scornfully: "So they persecuted Jesus of old." Another, reviling, asked "Will the Virgin Mary save you?" These blasphemies remind one of the mockings on Calvary. Some asked him how many wives he had, how many children, &c. These are the most decent of the insults, and are all that admit of publication."

Do we live in the nineteenth century, or have we been transported back to the period of civil commotions in the middle ages; when modern society was struggling into form, when feudal strife filled Europe with bloody intestine feuds, and when Guelph and Ghibelline caused the streets of Florence and Milan to run in blood? Do we live in a land of liberty and law, or in one of tyranny and anarchy? Has our noble constitution — the master work of human wisdom — become a dead letter; or what is worse, have its just and equitable provisions, securing equal civil and religious freedom to all, been openly contemned and trampled under foot? Have our people forgotten the price of liberty, that they now hold it so cheap? What will the friends of monarchy and the enemies of republicanism in the old world think and say, as they point in triumph to these sad commentaries, which we have written with our own hands, on our boasted fundamental principle of equal law and equal privileges to all? What will the radical republicans of Europe, with whom so many of our people profess to sympathize, answer, when their opponents will appeal to such practical workings of liberty as the above, in the great Model Republic across the Atlantic? Can any reasonable man doubt, that the excesses to which we allude will have the effect of greatly weakening, if not of wholly marring the cause of true and rational liberty throughout the world?

---

[1] Witness the assassination of poor McCarthy at Newark; and other murders mentioned in the public prints.

[2] Something more than fifty dollars

If history utters any warning, or teaches any lesson, it is this great truth: that persecution has never yet put down a good cause, nor materially served a bad one. Truth may be obscured or smothered for a time; it cannot be destroyed. Thus the sun may be darkened for a time by the interposing cloud, but anon his bright rays will break out again to illumine the world; no human power can wholly extinguish his light, much less blot him out from the heavens. Yet the sun will share the fate of all things created, and cease to exist; but the truth of God abideth forever. For more than eighteen centuries the Catholic Church has stood, a tower of strength, amidst the ruins of all things earthly, strewn in her pathway. Dynasties have changed, thrones have fallen, and sceptres have been broken around her; yet has she stood, and she still stands, stronger than ever:

> "She saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments, that now exist in the world; and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. . . Four times since the Church of Rome was established in western Christendom has the human intellect risen up against her yoke. Twice she remained completely victorious. Twice she came forth from the conflict bearing the marks of cruel wounds, but with the principle of life still strong within her. When we reflect upon the tremendous assaults which she has survived, we find it difficult to conceive in what way she is to perish."[1]

Nothing could, in fact, be more honorable to the Catholic Church than the mode of warfare which has been lately adopted to effect her ruin in this country. In appealing to passion and mob violence against her, her enemies virtually acknowledge that calm examination and sober reasoning are powerless for her destruction; by the necessity under which they find themselves to resort to misrepresentation and slander, they substantially concede that they would be worsted in the fair field of truthful statement and dispassionate argument. Thus, those Protestants who have been induced by prejudice and passion to favor this unhallowed mode of attack upon our Church, have really abandoned the vantage-ground in the controversy, and have thereby unwittingly yielded us the victory. Bad temper, unfairness, and violence in a disputant, greatly damage his cause, in the judgment of all calm and impartial men; while the party assailed by such weapons is always sure to win sympathy, and to gain on public opinion.

---

[1] Macaulay — Review of Ranke's History of the Popes

Another feature in the present violent warfare against us, is its glaring inconsistency. The men who are most prominent in the crusade are, in general, as unprincipled as the means they employ are detestable.[1] Professing to be the champions of freedom, their secret and even avowed object is to rob of freedom a large portion of their fellow citizens: — for their "war to the hilt against Romanism," as explained by their words and their *actions*, means nothing less than this. Professing to love the Bible, and boasting a wish to see the principles of the Bible triumphantly carried out in politics, they trample recklessly upon the most cherished principles of the Bible. The Bible says: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" they say, we must hate our neighbor, and declare war to the hilt against him, if he happen to belong to the oldest and most numerous body of Christians on the face of the earth. The Bible teaches, that we must love our enemies; they hate even their friends, or those at least who have never wronged them in thought or deed. The Bible inculcates the equitable principle, that we must do unto others, as we would wish others to do unto us under like circumstances; they teach that Catholics are to be excluded from the operation of this Gospel rule. The Bible teaches, that we are to be kind and indulgent to the poor stranger who comes within our borders; they teach that no treatment is too hard for the stranger, if he dare think for himself in matters of religion, and exercise his undoubted civil rights — clearly guaranteed to him by the constitution in the country of his adoption. These specifications will suffice to show, how our boasted lovers and champions of the Bible,— who are wont to parade the sacred volume in their riotous and bloody processions,[1] — wantonly trample it under foot, whenever its declarations conflict with their headlong passions.

---

[1] We speak here and throughout this Address chiefly of the leaders in the anti-Catholic warfare. We are convinced that very many among those who have enrolled themselves in the new political party are well meaning men, who have been misled by the arts of others, or who are even persuaded that they are doing God and their country service by proscribing Catholics!

Another glaring inconsistency in those who are foremost in the anti-Catholic crusade, is found in the fact, that while they profess to advocate a change of policy in regard to all foreigners who come to our shores, they secretly, and sometimes even openly, fraternise with the blood-stained Irish Orangemen and the truculent German infidels! Their boasted political principles are thus lost sight of, or openly violated, whenever there is a good opportunity for waging a "war to the hilt against Romanism." Every one is familiar with the late atrocious attack on the Catholic Church at Newark by Irish Orangemen, and how the press in the interest of the Know Nothings, as usual, added slander to outrage, by laying all the blame on the Irish Catholics. Well, sacrilege was perpetrated in the open light of day; murder was done on the person of an inoffensive man: yet up to the present day not one among the foreign Protestant perpetrators of these horrid deeds has been even arrested! Still the truth came out, after the first storm of passion had passed away; and even the New York Tribune, re-echoing the declaration of other papers, at length honorably proclaimed it as follows:

> THE NEWARK MURDER AND SACRILEGE.— "That Church stands fairly exculpated from all offense, and its devastation is an unprovoked and shameful outrage, which reflects great discredit on Newark and belligerent Protestantism. And it is worthy of note that while this is the fifth or sixth Catholic edifice, which has been destroyed or devastated by mob violence in our country, *there is no instance on record wherein a Protestant house of worship has been ravaged by Catholics.*"[2]

As if conscious of the dishonorable character of their warfare on Catholics, the new anti-Catholic party enters the field shrouded in secresy and wrapped up in mystery. Professing to be the champions of "American principles," they skulk away into darkness, and seem ashamed to show their faces in the light of day. If this be one of the "American principles," then are we done forever with American principles! Born and reared up in this free country, we have doated from our infancy on the glorious principles embodied in our noble declaration of independence, and in those cognate ones set forth in our matchless constitution. They have been the dream of our youth, and the idol of our maturer years. And we have had abundant opportunities to know, that those whom *choice*, and not the mere *accident* of birth, have made citizens of our happy country, have, without an exception known to us, entertained a fond predilection for American principles, scarcely surpassed in intensity by our own. But we and they had thought, in our simplicity, that *manliness* was one among those cherished "American principles": that it was even an essential part of the American character to be open, candid, and straight-forward in all its acts; that the American could have no possible cause to be ashamed either of his name, of his political doctrines, or of his acts; that he needed no cover of darkness to conceal either his purposes or his deeds. But we were mistaken; our dream has been dissipated; and we awake to the painful reality, that neither we nor our fathers knew anything about "American principles," until we were happily taught them by foreign infidels, incendiaries, and assassins, boasting the hallowed name of patriots and martyrs of liberty! Yet these were the very men against whose pernicious arts Washington had so solemnly warned us, when he bade us beware of foreign influence! The real danger to our republican institutions lies in the encouragement given to those mischievous men — the spawn of foreign revolutions — whom failure in their attempts abroad causes to be cast upon our shores. Received with open arms by our patriotic sympathy, they proceed forthwith to organize amongst us those dangerous secret political societies which were the chief instruments of their warfare in Europe. Hear what the venerable Josiah Quincy says of such societies:

---

[1] As they did during the Philadelphia Riots.

[2] New York Tribune, of September 8, 1854

> "The liberties of a people are never more certainly in the path of destruction, than when they trust themselves to the guidance of secret societies. Birds of the night are never birds of wisdom. One of them indeed received this name, but it was from its *looks*, and not from its moral and intellectual qualities. They are, for the most part birds of prey. The fate of a republic is sealed when the Bats take the lead of the Eagles."

Every reader of American history knows how Washington saved the country, by refusing to recognize Genet, the envoy of the bloody French republic; whose arts and influence among the people had well nigh brought ruin on our infant government. The calm judgment and wise forecast of Washington prevented us from being led away by this most dangerous "foreign influence;" leading to precisely such "entangling alliances," as the demagogue Kossuth, at a more recent period, sought, happily in vain, to bring about.

But enough on this branch of the subject. We cannot bring ourselves to believe, for a moment, that the narrow-minded, inconsistent, unscriptural, un-American, and utterly detestable spirit, exhibited by those among us who now take a leading part in the warfare against Catholics, is at all likely to become the settled policy of our yet happy and prosperous country. Should we, however, be wrong in this belief, and should that truculent spirit prevail for a time over sounder and more American principles; should the persecution of Catholics continue and increase until our churches will all be in ruins, and there will remain no resting place for our feet on the soil of this republic; then are we convinced, that amidst the ruins of our Church in this country will be strewn likewise the ruins of the republic itself! The liberal and enlarged principles of the latter will be annihilated; its greatness will be arrested and its glories dimmed; and while the stars of its flag may yet float in the heavens, its E PLURIBUS UNUM will be obliterated, and its many-colored stripes, emblematic of union in diversity — like its motto — will be blotted out forever.[1]

Still we are unshaken in our hope of better things in the future. There is, after all, a strongly conservative spirit and a practical good sense in the mass of our population, which needs only be fairly awakened, to frown down all attempts at fastening on our necks the system of narrow-minded and proscriptive policy of which we are speaking. To this practical sense and "sober second thought" alone do we now address ourselves; all reasoning with the unscrupulous faction which seeks to abridge or destroy our liberties, were worse than useless. We will accordingly devote the remaining portion of this Address to answering some principal objections made against us by our more reasonable opponents. Fully to refute them all, would require a volume; though the bulk of the charges might be answered, by simply saying that we are misrepresented. We will confine ourselves to those which affect our character as citizens:[2] and even here, we must be brief, though we hope that what we shall be able to say will be plain, straightforward, and to the purpose. Truth needs no gloss nor drapery; when presented in its simple and unadorned beauty, it best attracts the admiration, and wins the homage of all its candid and impartial votaries.

Almost all the accusations made against us are reducible to these two heads: first, that in religion we are intolerant and proscriptive; second, that in politics, we are enemies of republican institutions, and friends of a foreign despotism. We will proceed summarily to answer these two charges, together with some of the principal specifications alleged to support them. But as we cannot be reasonably expected in this Introductory Address to go into all the details necessary for the full elucidation of a subject so vast in the topics which it must necessarily embrace, we shall claim the privilege of referring, as we proceed, to the Essays contained in this volume for such additional facts and illustrations as they may supply, on the points which will successively come under discussion.

---

[1] Or, if not wholly obliterated, at least severed from the unity of the Flag: the *stars* being for the native born, and the *stripes* for the foreigner, escaping from tyranny to this noble asylum of freedom! This is the beautiful thought of Archbishop Hughes.

[2] In the following Pages, we answer many of the most current popular charges against the Church; particularly in the Theological Essays, Part ii, p. 397, seqq.

I. In regard to the charge of exclusiveness and intolerance, two things, which are often confounded, should be accurately distinguished: namely, *theological* exclusiveness and *civil* intolerance. Our Protestant brethren have, in general, very vague and loose ideas upon this subject. Among them, the term *religious liberality* generally implies what might with more propriety be called *latitudinarianism.* The fashionable theory, which now obtains extensively among those outside of the Catholic Church, holds that it matters not what a Christian believes, provided he try to be a moral man and a good citizen; in other words, that Christ either taught no specific doctrines whatever, or that He required, as a condition of salvation, belief in none which He did teach, or at most in but a few fundamental articles. When those, who maintain the obligation of belief in these fundamental principles only, are called upon to define them, they are often embarrassed for an answer; some giving a wider, some a more limited range to the points in question. All, however, agree in advocating, to a greater or less extent, the latitudinarian principle above indicated.

Now we Catholics strongly protest against this popular theory, as tending to unsettle all faith, and to subvert Christianity itself. We hold that Christ delivered a definite system of religion; that *all* the doctrines which He taught are equally true, and equally to be believed; that He died on the cross to seal the truth of them all with His blood; and that consequently all the articles of faith which he established, in a manner so solemn, must be believed by all who have the means of knowing them. In other words, we hold that Christ, being the Son of God and Truth itself, did establish, and in the very nature of things, could have established, but ONE RELIGION; and that, as He founded it for the salvation of mankind, He must have required that it should be embraced, in all its parts, by all who would be saved. This principle we regard as almost self-evident; and we cannot see how it can be denied by any, who have definite ideas on the nature and purpose of the Christian religion, or who believe in the divinity of its Author and Founder. If the Christian religion was not, after all, necessary to salvation, then why did the Son of God undergo so much labor, and endure so much obloquy and suffering for its establishment? Why did He say, speaking of all the doctrines which He had taught without any distinction: "He that believeth not, shall be condemned?"[1] Why does His inspired apostle Paul declare, in the name of his Master,—"Without faith it is impossible to please God!"[2]

But our present purpose does not require us to discuss this or any other doctrinal point; we are merely stating our belief. What then do we hold in regard to those who are outside of the one true Church of Christ? Do we condemn them all alike and indiscriminately? We do not. We leave them to their own responsibility before God, by whose unerring judgment they will, like ourselves, stand or fall. If not united with the Church, *through their own fault,*—having the light and opportunity to find out what it is, and neglecting to correspond therewith,—they are in imminent danger of losing their immortal souls, for which Jesus died. If they are separated from it, *without any fault of theirs,*—should there be any such,—they will not be condemned *for this;* for God condemns none but the guilty. Whether they are out of the true church with or without their own fault, the great Searcher of hearts alone can decide; and in His hands we leave them.

But the Catholic Church teaches farther, with Christ Himself, that we must "love our neighbor as ourselves;" that we must bear the burdens of one another; that we must pray for and love even our enemies, and do good to those who do evil to us; that, when it is question of solacing misery or succoring distress, we must not stop to inquire the belief of the sufferer: in a word, that without charity towards *all* mankind, the profession of Christianity were vain and profitless. The Catholic Church enjoins upon her children to be just in all their dealings, to be good citizens, to be good neighbors, to be good parents, good children, good husbands, good wives;—good in every relation of society; but especially, to be good Christians, loving God above all things, and performing all their actions for His honor and glory.

If these principles be intolerant, then must we plead guilty to the charge. But if they be such as are essentially connected with Christianity itself, such as alone are true and consistent with the whole tenor and the very end and aim of the Christian religion; then are we content to bear whatever of obloquy may attach to our belief in them. If, to be considered charitable, we are called upon to sacrifice truth and common sense itself, and to say that a hundred contradictory systems of belief may all be equally true, then must we submit it to the imputation of uncharitableness. In this we do but imitate St. Paul, who sought not to please men, but rather to be the servant of Christ;[1] and we do but share in the ignominy of Christ Himself, who, instead of flattering human error, died for the truth.

---

[1] St. Mark xvi.

[2] Hebrews xi.

But does the Catholic Church "call down fire from heaven" on the heads of those who dissent from her belief? By no means: hers has been at all times a different spirit altogether, and one more consonant with that of her divine Founder. Her mission has been to win sinners to repentance, to inculcate mercy and love, not hatred and bitterness. The first laws for the punishment of heretics were enacted by the early Christian emperors, not by the Popes, the bishops, or the Church. The latter deprecated all rigor against the sectaries, unless in particular cases, where it seemed indispensable to restrain violence, or to redress open and glaring outrages against religious liberty.[2] The Catholic bishops and the Popes were themselves often the victims of imperial claims to regulate the affairs of the Church; and it is very doubtful whether they could have prevented the enactment and execution of the laws in question. The Popes were always opposed to violent measures for the propagation of the faith among pagans; and they were also in the habit of throwing the shield of their protection around the Jews, whenever their religious privileges and civil rights were infringed by intemperate Christian zeal.[3] The Church has thus always adopted and acted upon the maxim of Tertullian, who, more than sixteen centuries ago, claimed religious liberty for Christians as an indefeasable right, growing out of the very nature of religion itself: "RELIGIONIS NON EST RELIGIONEM COGERE — IT IS NOT THE PART OF RELIGION TO ESTABLISH RELIGION BY FORCE."[4] Her spirit of mildness was breathed forth by the great St. Augustine, when, writing to Donatus, the imperial Proconsul in Africa, he deprecated all undue severity against the Arians and Donatists, and said: "We desire them to be *corrected, not slain*."[5] As one of her greatest Popes, St. Leo the Great, says: "The lenity of the Church being content with the priestly sentence, shrinks from sanguinary vengeance;"[6] and she sanctions or tolerates severe measures emanating from the princes of the earth, only when, without them, society

[1] "Do I seek to please men! If I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ."—*Galatians* i, 10.

[2] See the evidence on this subject, presented in considerable detail by Archbishop Kenrick, in his work on the Primacy; Part ii, chap. viii.

[3] For many facts sustaining this assertion, see "The Primacy," ibid.

[4] The whole passage of Tertullian, as translated by Archbishop Kenrick, is as follows: "It is man's right and privilege, that each one should worship what he thinks proper; nor can the religion of another injure or profit him. Neither is it a part of religion to compel its adoption; since this should be spontaneous, not forced, as even sacrifices are asked only of the cheerful giver." Primacy, ibid.

[5] Epist. Donato.

[6] Epist. ad Turribium.

itself would be endangered, "all regard for probity destroyed, all bonds of society dissolved, and divine and human laws at once overturned."[1] Hence that celebrated and well known maxim, embodied as an axiom in her Canon Law: "ECCLESIA ABHORRET A SANGUINE—THE CHURCH ABHORS BLOODSHED." So far is this principle carried, that a standing rule of her discipline forbids the ordination, not only of those who have been guilty of shedding blood, but also of those who, whether as judges, accusers, or voluntary witnesses, have co-operated towards passing a sentence of death on a fellow man, or even one of bodily mutilation without taking life.[2] From the earliest period of her history, she has taught and acted upon these principles. To furnish one out of a hundred examples of this, it is well known that in the fourth century, St. Martin, the illustrious bishop of Tours, openly censured two Spanish bishops—Ithacius and Idacius—for teaching that the Priscillianists should be punished with corporal chastisement or death for their wicked heresy, though this tended to the subversion of social order itself; and the Church sustained him in his truly Christian course.[3]

Persecution is not, and never has been a doctrine of the Catholic Church. Our standard writers have often boldly defied their adversaries to establish the contrary proposition; but their challenge has never been fairly met. Surely, if the Catholic Church had ever taught persecution, as a doctrine, her enemies could tell us when and where she inculcated the offensive tenet. If she ever persecuted, *as a Church*, they could certainly furnish us with such facts and specifications on the subject, as would not be susceptible of either explanation or reply. The Catholic Church is no secret society; she has taught boldly, and acted out her teaching openly in the arena of the world for more than eighteen centuries; and if the charge of persecution could be sustained against her, it would long since have been done. The attempt has indeed been made, but it has utterly failed. Our writers have scattered to the winds the arguments of their opponents on this subject, and have shown that, in the majority of cases, the latter have substituted vague declamation for *facts*, fiery appeals to passion for sober argument.

But have not Catholics persecuted in times past? We do not deny it; but we answer, that they did so in virtue of no doctrine of their Church. If the mere act of persecution proved the doctrine, then it would follow that all the Protestant sects hold the same odious tenet; for all of them have been stained with persecution, at one period or other of their history. They have all persecuted Catholics, whenever and wherever they had the power to do so; and almost all of them have likewise been guilty of the glaring inconsistency of persecuting brother Protestants, for daring, in the exercise of the conceded right of private judgment, to think differently from themselves! But who would infer from this undoubted fact, that Protestants generally hold it as a *doctrine*, that all who dissent from their particular views should be put down by fire and sword? Such a conclusion would be clearly illogical and grievously unjust. Now we claim the application of the same equitable principle to the charge of persecution brought against our Church; and surely our claim is not unreasonable.

---

[1] Ibid. He refers to the fatal errors of the ancient Manicheans.

[2] See our Canonists—*passim*.

[3] The great St Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, united with St. Martin in this charitable interposition in favor of the persecuted Priscillianists.

But the Catholic Church professes to be infallible and unchangeable, whereas the Protestant sects admit that they are liable to err, and have often erred in times past. We freely grant the latter proposition; in regard to the former, our adversaries lose sight of a very obvious distinction, which truth demands should be made. The Catholic Church is unchangeable in *doctrine*, but not in *discipline*. The latter may and does vary in its details, according to times, places, and circumstances. So that, even if our opponents should prove that our Church had, at any period of her history, adopted persecution as a line of conduct under particular circumstances, or as a general *discipline*, they would not still make good their position. But have they established even this proposition? We believe not; and to show how inconclusive are their arguments, on a point which does not directly touch the real matter at issue, we will briefly refer to a few of their specifications.

They allege, with an air of triumph, the third Canon of the fourth Council of Lateran,[1] which excommunicated heretics, and ordered that they should be delivered up for punishment to the secular power. Our answer is obvious. In the first place, it is manifest that no *doctrine* is promulgated by this canon, but that only a rule of action is laid down for a particular case. 2. We may observe, that Mathew Paris, a weighty cotemporary historian, denies that this and the other canons were the acts of the council itself;[2] and that the English Protestant church historian, Collier, declares his belief that the third canon in particular is not genuine.[3] 3. But, waiving this, and admitting the genuineness of the canon, every reader of Church History knows that it was enacted with the full concurrence, and probably on the positive demand, of the temporal sovereigns of Christendom, who were nearly all of them present at the council, either personally, or by their ambassadors.[1] Some of the provisions of the canon could not, in fact, have been enacted, much less, carried into execution, but with the consent and co-operation of the temporal sovereigns; especially of those who were chiefly concerned. It may here be remarked, in general, that many of the councils held during the middle ages were not exclusively ecclesiastical conventions, but rather congresses of all Christendom, representing the temporal as well as the spiritual power.[2] 4. The severe provisions of this canon were directed against the Albigenses, who then infested the south of France, than whom a more pestilent sect probably never existed. They were the sworn foes of all religion, of all decency, and of all social order. Wherever they appeared, desolation and ruin followed in their pathway.[3] They were the Jacobins and *Sans-culottes* of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; and they were, if possible, even more truculent and bloody than the Jacobins themselves. They were the enemies of both God and man. Worse than our modern Mormons, they condemned marriage altogether, and gave a free rein to every brutal passion and appetite. Had they succeeded in establishing their principles, all order and all civilization would have been at an end. Is it any wonder then, that all Christendom — the State no less than the Church — rose up in mass to put down, even by force, a sect so monstrous? Is it not plain also, that, such being the facts, the severe measures sanctioned by the council constitute an exceptional case, which should not be alleged as evidence of a general rule? And for the truth of this picture, we appeal with confidence to all cotemporary history. We may safely apply to them what the learned Protestant church historian Mosheim candidly says of a cognate sect — the Brethren of the Free Spirit:[4]

---

[1] Held A.D. 1215.

[2] Math. Paris — ad annum 1215, apud Milner — Letters to a Prebendary.

[3] Collier, Ecclesiastical History; vol. i, p. 424: quoted ibid.

> "Certain writers, who have accustomed themselves to entertain a high idea of the sanctity of all those who, in the middle ages, separated themselves from the Church of Rome, suspect the inquisitors of having falsely attributed impious doctrines to the Brethren of the Free Spirit.

---

[1] There were thus present at this council the emperors of Germany and Constantinople, the kings of France, England, Aragon, Sicily, Hungary, Jerusalem, and Cyprus; besides several minor sovereigns.

[2] As during the period in question, society was struggling into form, and there were no standing armies to repel strongly organized and wide-spread aggressions upon social order, expeditions of a general character for the defense of society were decided on in councils of the European sovereigns; and when the enemies of order were likewise the foes of religion, these expeditions were called crusades.

[3] For facts and details on this subject, we beg to refer to "The Primacy," by Archhbishop Kenrick, sup. cit.

[4] During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries a great part of Europe was infested with pernicious sects, which revived under different forms the anti-social errors of the ancient Manicheans. They were all alike, though they bore the different names of Turlupins, Begards, Brethren of the Free Spirit, and Albigenses. The Petro-Brusians were a kindred sect.

But this suspicion is entirely *groundless*, &c. . . . Their shocking violation of decency was a consequence of their pernicious system. They looked upon decency and modesty as marks of inward corruption. . . . Certain enthusiasts amongst them maintained, that the believer could not sin, let his conduct be ever so horrible or atrocious."[1]

But what have we to say on the Inquisition, especially the Spanish Inquisition; which, with the alleged sanction of the Church, filled Christendom with so many horrors for ages? What explanation are we to give of what occurred at the Council of Constance, which, contrary to plighted faith, consigned John Huss and Jerome of Prague to the flames? Satisfactory answers on both these points could be easily given; and they have been given a hundred times already. But as we devote special Essays to these subjects in the following pages,[2] we must refer the candid reader to them for details; and we do so with entire confidence, that all who will take the trouble to read these papers, will rise from the perusal with the conviction, that even those darker passages in the Church's history do not make out the case of persecution against her, even as a point of discipline.

Come we now to times nearer our own day. What are the statistics of persecution during the last three centuries, since the dawn of what has been called by its friends the *reformation?* And how stands the case at present in Europe, and *in America!* No candid man who has read history aright will deny, that during this period, and especially at present, we have been, and are now, much more sinned against than sinning in the matter of persecution. Catholics who speak the English language, in particular, have been for three hundred years, almost without intermission, the victims of the most ruthless intolerance. Robbed of their church and often of their personal property; slandered in their reputation; hunted down by the myrmidons of a persecuting government; branded as traitors and outlaws in their own country and that of their fathers before them: such has been their treatment in Protestant England up to a comparatively recent period; ever since the fatal day when the tyrant Henry VIII.—the Nero of modern times—quarreled with the Pope, and violently severed the unity of the Church, because she could not and would not sanction his headlong passions, to the injury of a virtuous wife![3] In Ireland, the fate of the Catholics was still harder, and of longer continuance.[4]

---

[1] Eccles. History, vol. iii. p. 284; Maclain's translation—quoted by Milner.

[2] See the Articles on the Spanish Inquisition, and on John Huss and the Hussites; pp. 213, 191 seqq.

[3] See the third Article on Church History p. 57 seqq, for farther details on the reformation in England.

[4] In the Article on Ireland and the Irish—p. 506 seqq., we have sketched the sufferings of Catholic Ireland under English persecution.

We go even farther, and state, as a fact which no one will deny, who retains the least regard for historic truth, that in every country in Europe where the reformation succeeded, Catholics were invariably persecuted, almost as atrociously and for nearly as long a time, as in England and Ireland. Robbery, sacrilege, slander, civil commotions and bloodshed, were everywhere the arms with which incipient Protestantism assailed those, whose only crime was their honest wish to adhere to the faith, and worship at the altars of their forefathers, and of the forefathers of those very men too who were engaged in persecuting them! Perhaps in Switzerland, an old Catholic republic with some remains of the ancient Catholic freedom, the persecuting spirit was less rampant than elsewhere; but even in Switzerland, with its glowing Catholic memories of William Tell, Furst, and Melchtal, we find no exception to the remark just made. Even there the fiercely intolerant spirit of the early reformers was not softened. This we establish, by abundant evidence, in a special Essay on the Reformation in Switzerland.[1]

We conclude this branch of the subject with an extract from the Edinburg Review—an unexceptionable Protestant authority—which candidly places in its true light the character of the self-styled reformers, in the matter of persecution:[2]

> "Protestant writers, in general, are apt to describe the reformation as a struggle for religious freedom. . . . Now, we humbly apprehend, that the free exercise of private judgment was most heartily abhorred by the first reformers, except only where the persons who assumed it had the good fortune to be exactly of their opinion. . . . The martyrdoms of Servetus, in Geneva, and of Joan Bocher, in England, are notable instances of the religious freedom which prevailed in the pure and primitive state of the Protestant churches. It is obvious, also, that the freedom for which our first reformers so strenuously contended, did not, by any means, include a freedom to think as the Catholics thought; that is to say, to think as all Europe had thought for many ages, and as the greatest part of Europe thought at the very time and continue to think to this very day. *The complete extirpation of the Catholic Church, not merely as a public establishment, but as a tolerated sect, was the avowed object of our first reformers.* In 1560, by an act of the parliament, which established the reformation in Scotland, both the sayers and hearers of Mass, whether in public or in private, were, for the first offense, to suffer confiscation of all their goods, together with corporal punishment, at the discretion of the magistrate; they were to be punished by banishment for the second offense; and *by death* for the third! . . . . It was not possible for the most bigoted Catholic to inculcate more distinctly the complete extirpation of the opinions and worship of the Protestants, than John Knox inculcated as a most sacred duty, incumbent on the civil government in the first instance, and if the civil government is remiss, incumbent

---

[1] Page 234, seqq.

[2] For the intolerant character of the early English reformers, see Article III, on Church History p. 57 seqq. where we give Macaulay's portrait of Cranmer.

on the people, to extirpate completely the opinions and worship of the Catholics, and even to massacre the Catholics, man, woman, and child. . . . . If the government had followed the directions of the clergy, the Catholics would have been extirpated by the sword. . . . In the reigns of Charles the Second, and of his brother, a Protestant prelacy, in alliance with a Protestant administration, outstript the wishes of those arbitrary monarchs in the persecution of their Protestant countrymen. It is needless to weary ourselves or our readers with disgusting details, which the curious in martyrology may find in various publications. Everybody knows that the martyrdoms were both numerous and cruel, but perhaps the comparative mildness of the *Catholic* Church of Scotland, is not so generally known. Knox has investigated the matter with commendable diligence, but has not been able to muster more than eighteen martyrs who perished by the hand of the executioner, from the year 1500, when heresy first began, till 1559, when the Catholics had no longer the power to persecute. . . . It is, indeed, a horrid list; but far short of the numbers, who, during the twenty-two years immediately previous to the Revolution, were capitally executed in Scotland for the '*wicked error*' of separation from the worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church."[1]

While we heartily unite with every lover of freedom in condemning all acts of persecution for conscience sake which have ever been perpetrated, no matter what the alleged motive or pretext, candor will compel even our adversaries to acknowledge, that in the persecution of Catholics by Protestants, there were aggravating circumstances, which were not found in the persecution of the latter by the former. Protestant persecution was purely aggressive; Catholic persecution was mainly defensive: the former sought to rob Catholics of all they held most dear; the latter was directed chiefly towards maintaining the most undoubted and most sacred rights. Catholics were in possession; Protestants aimed at violently ousting them from their firesides and their altars, and taking their place. Catholics sought to preserve the ancient faith and worship, hallowed and rendered dear by a thousand glorious memories; Protestants sought to substitute for it, frequently by violence, new doctrines and new forms, about which they were not themselves agreed, and which they claimed the right of changing as often as they might judge proper.

Waiving all this, however, let us strike evenly the balance of persecution in the past; burying whatever is unpleasant in generous oblivion, and forgiving as we hope to be forgiven. Now, how stands the account of religious persecution at the present day? Is all the intolerance on the side of Catholics? Or have not Protestants at least their own full share of the guilt, which they are so free to charge exclusively on others? Let us see.

The impartial comparison between Catholic and Protestant countries, on the subject of persecution in late years, exhibits a fearful balance against the latter. It may be stated without exaggeration, that there is scarcely a Protestant country on the face of the earth, which does not even at this enlightened day, persecute Catholics, in one form or another, or which has not persecuted them during the present century; while there is, on the contrary, scarcely a Catholic nation in the world, which does persecute, or has recently persecuted Protestants. Strange as this may sound in the ears of those who have been misled into the persuasion, that the Catholic is essentially a persecuting Church, and that we owe religious freedom entirely to Protestantism, it is nevertheless true. Here are the facts; and first on the Catholic side.

---

[1] Edinburgh Review, Article VIII., entitled "Toleration of the Reformers," No. 53.

France is Catholic, and France not only grants the fullest liberty of worship to her small number of Protestant citizens, but she even pays their ministers out of the public treasury. Austria is Catholic; and Austria, despotic though she be usually represented, concedes a full measure of religious liberty to the Protestant minority, allowing them even to have their own separate schools, supported, like those of the Catholic majority, from the common fund.[1] Bavaria is Catholic, and Bavaria also allows equal civil and religious privileges to her Protestant subjects. Belgium is Catholic, and Belgium has a fundamental law, granting unrestricted and equal religious freedom to all. Italy, Spain, and Portugal, with perhaps some of the colonies of the two last, may be thought to form exceptions to this general rule; but though their policy be somewhat proscriptive on the score of religion, we read of no acts of persecution, worthy the name, having been recently perpetrated therein. In the first place, they evidently could not have been guilty of persecuting their Protestant citizens, for the very simple reason that they have no Protestant citizens. If they are jealous, especially of English Protestants, who sometimes pass through those countries, distributing tracts and Bibles, it has generally happened, because England has rendered herself justly odious on the continent of Europe by her constant political intrigues among her neighbors, often carried on under the guise of religious zeal; and because her tract distributers are suspected, frequently with too much reason, of being political propagandists, and secret agents paid for their services.

The intrigues of Lord Minto in Italy, and those of Bulwer and others in Spain, are too well known to require proof. One of the principal means employed by the hired agents of these men for strengthening English influence, was the distribution of Bibles and tracts, and the accompanying efforts to make proselytes among the Catholic inhabitants. The intrigue, however, was unsuccessful; Bulwer was compelled to leave Spain, and Minto is now detested in Italy as never was man detested before. The affair of the Madiai, about which so great an outcry was lately made, may be easily explained in this way. Their imprisonment was the result of their active attempts at proselytism, as *paid* emissaries of England; not of their wish to profess and practise religious principles opposed to those of the Catholic majority. It is a notorious fact, that in both Italy and Spain, Protestant travelers or temporary residents are never molested on account of peculiarities in their religious creed or worship; provided they, on their side, do not interfere with the faith and worship of the Catholic population. The Anglican church and our American Protestants have places of worship at Rome itself, under the eyes and with the permission of the Pope; who not only allows them to assemble therein for religious purposes as often as they wish, but protects them in the enjoyment of their religious freedom. Protestants have similar religious privileges in Tuscany, and elsewhere in Italy. At Rome, at Florence, at Leghorn, and in other places, they have also their separate cemeteries. If this latter privilege has not as yet been granted to Protestant strangers sojourning in Spain, we have little doubt that it will soon be conceded; whenever, in fact, it will be demanded in a proper manner, by a sufficient number of Protestants to render a separate burial place an object of importance or necessity. The only complaint which the very few non-Catholics passing through, or residing for a time in Spain, can now make on this subject is, that in case of death they are not buried in ground expressly set apart and blessed for Catholic interment, or with the solemnities which usually accompany the Catholic funeral; — privileges which they would scarcely covet, even in this free country. Those who make so much noise about Spanish intolerance in the matter of Protestant funerals, wholly lose sight of, or purposely conceal the fact, that in Protestant England — where there are a thousand resident Catholic *citizens* for every Protestant *stranger* in Spain — Catholics are not allowed to be buried, with any pomp or ceremonial, in the public cemeteries; though these are, in many instances, old Catholic burial grounds, wrested by violence from their original Catholic purpose by the English Protestant government! The Catholics of England have thus much more reason to complain on this subject, than have the very few Protestants who may happen to be for a time in Spain.

---

[1] The authority for this statement will be given a little farther on.

Let us now take a rapid glance at the Protestant nations of Europe. In all of them, without an exception known to us, there is an established religion, with a union of Church and State. In the freest amongst them all — England — Catholics are barely tolerated; they are continually loaded with obloquy and abuse, and are frequently made the victims of petty legal enactments. Witness the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill; the late savage outbreak of indignation at the re-establishment of the Catholic hierarchy; the bitter prosecution of Dr. Newman; and the monster grievance of all — the bloated church establishment — fattened on the sweat and blood of the crushed and down-trodden masses of the people. Protestant Holland recently persecuted her Catholic subjects to such an extent, as to drive them into a rebellion, the result of which was the independence of Catholic Belgium. Protestant Prussia lately imprisoned the venerable Archbishop of Cologne, to compel him to sacrifice his conscientious convictions; and Protestant Baden is now actively engaged in a similar disgraceful persecution of the venerable Archbishop Vicari, of Freyburg, and of his clergy, for the same unhallowed motive. But the Archbishop of Freyburg is destined to triumph over the intolerant Protestant government of the Grand Duke, as he of Cologne triumphed over the persecuting Prussian monarch.[1] In Protestant Sweden, he who dares become a Catholic is banished the country, and his property is confiscated to the state; and we believe a similar law exists in Protestant Denmark. In Sweden, but a few years ago, the distinguished painter Nilsen suffered the full penalty of this iniquitous law; and more recently still several ladies, distinguished for their piety, have had the same severe sentence passed on them. Heartless must be the persecutor, who does not spare even the weakness of woman! Finally, every one knows how fiercely the Swiss Protestants raged against the Catholics, when the latter were overpowered by superior numbers in the late civil war, brought about itself by the most reckless Protestant intolerance; how the holy Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva was banished from his country; how the Jesuits were expelled, and the poor defenseless nuns were driven from their convents; how church property was confiscated, including even that of the benevolent monks of Mount St. Bernard, who had saved so many valuable Protestant lives amidst the snows of the Alps; and how an iron yoke was there placed on the necks of the down-trodden Catholic minority.

If there be a Protestant country in the world, which has not even recently persecuted Catholics, we have not yet learned its name; and it ill becomes our opponents to charge *all* the persecution on the Catholic

---

[1] What aggravates the hardship of the persecution in regard to both these distinguished Catholic prelates, is the circumstance, that both were octogenarians of irreproachable character, whose age and virtues should have protected them from such outrages.

Church. A persistence in preferring such an accusation, against all evidence, reminds us of the fable concerning the wolf and the lamb. It was the lamb who always muddled the stream! No one can contravene these facts; and if they be unpleasant, we have at least the consolation to think that we had no agency in making them *facts;* and that we allege them at present only in self-vindication.

Even in our own country, though it boasts so loudly of its freedom, how often have Catholics been made the victims of religious intolerance! Every one knows the fierce spirit which is now invoked against them; every one remembers the smouldering ruins of the Ursuline Convent on Mount Benedict, and those of the Philadelphia Churches burned by a savage mob; and all are acquainted with those more recent outrages against our religious liberties to which we have already alluded. We may add, that in some of our hospitals, alms-houses, and other public institutions, supported by the money of all, Catholics are often denied the services of their clergymen and the consolations of religion, even at their dying hour![1]

On the contrary, have Catholics ever persecuted, or have they ever shown even the slightest disposition to persecute, their dissenting brethren in this country? If they have, we desire to know when and where they made the attempt. One thing is certain, — and no one can deny it, or rob them of this glory: — they were the first who reared on this broad continent, in their own noble colony of Maryland, the glorious banner of civil and religious liberty. All must award them this praise; which they deserve the more, because, at that very time, the Puritans of New England, and the Episcopalians of Virginia were busily engaged in persecuting their brother Protestants for conscience sake;[2] and the former were moreover enacting proscriptive blue laws, and hanging witches![3]

II. Come we now to the other charge against Catholics; —that they cannot, consistently with their principles, be good citizens of a republican government. Catholics cannot consistently be republicans! And pray, who originated all the free principles which lie at the basis of our own noble constitution? Who gave us trial by jury, *habeas corpus*, stationary courts, and the principle, — for which we fought and conquered in our revolutionary struggle against Protestant England, — that taxes are not to be levied without the free consent of those who pay them? Are we indebted to Protestantism for even ONE of these cardinal elements of free government? No; not for one. They all date back to the good old Catholic times, in the middle ages — some three hundred years before the dawn of the reformation! Our Catholic forefathers gave them all to us; not one of them do we owe to Protestants.

---

[1] Cases of this petty persecution have occurred in Cincinnati, and in other places, particularly in the Eastern and Northern States.

[2] See Bancroft's History — Maryland.

[3] For full details on this subject, read the Essays on Our Colonial Blue Laws, P. 353, seqq.

Again, we are indebted to Catholics for all the republics which ever existed in Christian times, down to the year 1776; for those of Switzerland, Venice, Genoa, Andorra, San Marino, and a host of minor free commonwealths, which sprang up in the "dark" ages. Some of these republics lingered until a comparatively recent date; some still exist, proud monuments and unanswerable evidences of Catholic devotion to freedom. These facts no one can deny; they stand out too boldly on the historic record. They are acknowledged by Protestants, no less than by Catholics. We subjoin the testimony of an able writer in the New York Tribune, believed to be Bayard Taylor, who is connected with the management of that journal. This distinguished traveler — a staunch Protestant — appeals to history, and speaks from personal observation. He writes:

> "Truth compels us to add that the oldest republic now existing is that of San Marino, not only Catholic but wholly surrounded by the especial dominion of the Popes, who might have crushed it like an egg-shell at any time these last thousand years — but they didn't. The only republic we ever traveled in besides our own is Switzerland, half of its cantons or states entirely Catholic, yet never that we have heard of unfaithful to the cause of freedom. They were nearly all Roman Catholics, from the southern cantons of Switzerland, whom Austria so ruthlessly expelled from Lombardy after the suppression of the last revolt in Milan, accounting them natural born republicans and revolutionists; and we suppose Austria is not a Know-Nothing on this point. We never heard the Catholics of Hungary accused of backwardness in the late glorious struggle of their country for freedom, though its leaders were Protestants, fighting against a leading Catholic power avowedly in favor of religious as well as civil liberty. And chivalric, unhappy Poland, almost wholly Catholic, has made as gallant struggles for freedom as any other nation, while of the three despotisms that crushed her but one was Catholic. But enough. We do not hope to stop the crusade of intolerance and violence now setting against the Catholics, calling for their disfranchisement, and threatening their temporary exclusion from all public trusts. Epidemics of this sort must have their course; and this one has some truth and a large amount of honest bigotry on which to base its operations. Quite a number, whose religion never till now did them much good or harm, will ride into office on the back of their resonant Protestantism, and that will be the end of the matter."

The reformation dawned on the world in the year 1517. What did it do for the cause of human freedom from that date, down to 1776 — when our own republic arose? Did it strike one blow for liberty during these two centuries and a half? Did it originate one republican principle, or found one solitary republic? Not one. In Germany, where it had full sway, it ruthlessly trampled in the dust all the noble franchises of the Catholic middle ages; it established political despotism everywhere; it united church and state; in a word it brought about that very state of things which continues to exist, with but slight amelioration, even down to the present day. In England, it did the same; it broke down the bulwarks of the British constitution, derived from the Catholic Magna Charta; it set at naught popular rights, and gave to the king or queen unlimited power in church and state; and it required a bloody struggle and a revolution, one hundred and fifty years afterwards, to restore to something of their former integrity the old chartered rights of the British people.[1]

Thus Protestantism has boasted much, but it has really done little for the cause of human freedom. But are we not at least indebted to it for our own revolution, and for the liberties which it has secured for us? We cheerfully award to our Protestant fellow-citizens the praise, which is so justly due them, for *their* share in the glorious struggle; but they should also, in common justice, allow to Catholics the credit of having zealously co-operated with them, to the full extent of their means, in bringing about a result so glorious and so beneficial. He who was the most wealthy among the signers of our Declaration of Independence, and who consequently periled most in putting his name to that instrument, was the Catholic CHARLES CARROLL, of CARROLTON; whom Providence permitted to survive all his fellow-patriots, as if to rebuke the fierce and anti-republican spirit of intolerance, which was so soon to be evoked from the abyss against his brethren in religion. Catholic soldiers fought side by side with their Protestant brethren in the patriotic struggle; and when our energies were exhausted, and the stoutest hearts entertained the most gloomy forebodings as to the final issue, Catholic France stepped gallantly forth to the rescue of our infant freedom, almost crushed by an overwhelming English *Protestant* tyranny![2] Many of our most sagacious statesmen have believed, that, but for this timely aid, our Declaration of Independence could scarcely have been made good.

Our enemies point, with an air of triumph, to the principles of Washington. We cheerfully accept the appeal. After the struggle was over, and Washington was unanimously elected first President of the new republic, he received a congratulatory address from the Catholics of the country, in which the following passage is found:

---

[1] For more on this subject, see the Essay on the Influence of Catholicity on Civil Liberty; Page 121, seqq.

[2] Catholic Spain also subsequently lent us her aid against England

> "This prospect of national prosperity is peculiarly pleasing to us on another account, because whilst our country preserves her freedom and independence, we shall have a well founded title to claim from her justice equal rights of citizenship, as the price of our blood spilt under your eyes, and of our common exertions for her defense under your auspicious conduct; rights rendered more dear to us by the remembrance of former hardships."[1]

To this portion of the Address, the father of his country replied as follows:

> "As mankind become more liberal, they will be more apt to allow, that all those who conduct themselves as worthy members of the community are equally entitled to the protection of civil government. I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality. And I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget *the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution, and the establishment of their government; or, the important assistance they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed.*"[2]

We ask no more than that to which Washington believed us justly entitled,—a fair share in the civil and religious liberties which our fathers aided to secure equally to all American citizens. We ask for no exclusive privilege whatsoever; we claim only our clear and undoubted rights, in common with our fellow-citizens.

But are not Catholics the subjects of a foreign prince, the Pope? This slander—like almost everything else said against us—has been refuted so many thousand times already, that we are almost afraid to tire the patience, or insult the understanding of our readers by answering it again. No man of common intelligence or information need be told, at this late day, that the obedience we owe to the Pope is confined entirely to religion and to spiritual things; and that he neither claims, nor we allow, any jurisdiction over us in temporal matters affecting our civil allegiance. This question has been so long settled throughout the civilized world, that its revival at present appears to be wholly useless, if not utterly absurd.[3] When it was a question, more than sixty years ago, of removing some of the cruel penal laws under which the Catholics of

---

[1] The Address was signed by Bishop Carroll of Baltimore, on the part of the Catholic clergy, and by Charles Carroll of Carrolton, Daniel Carroll, Thomas Fitzimmons, and Dominic Lynch, on the part of the Catholic laity. See Biographical Sketch of the Most Rev. John Carroll, by John Carroll Brent; p. 146, 147.

[2] Spark's Life and Writings of Washington, vol. xii.

[3] As early as the beginning of the seventeenth century, St. Francois de Sales deprecated the discussion of this question on many accounts, and among other reasons, because he considered it "*useless*, since the Pope, in fact, at that day asked nothing of kings and princes in this respect—*Inutile*, parceque le Pape, par le fait, ne demande rien aujourd'hui aux rois et aux princes pour ce regard." Letter to a Lady. Vie du Saint, par le Curé de St. Sulpice,—in 2 volumes. Vol. ii, p. 106: Paris, 1854.

England had been so long suffering, this very question in regard to the nature and extent of papal jurisdiction was discussed; and it was then settled to the entire satisfaction of Mr. Pitt and of the whole British parliament, which accordingly passed the Catholic Relief Bill.[1] The oath of allegiance freely taken by Catholic bishops, and members of parliament, and officers of the government in Great Britain and Ireland, with the sanction of the Popes themselves, expressely disclaims belief in any civil power or jurisdiction over British subjects, as inherent in the sovereign Pontiffs.

To prevent all possibility of misunderstanding on this subject, and to remove every pretext for calumny, the Popes authorized a change in the oath taken by a Bishop at his consecration, striking out all obscure clauses of feudal origin, and retaining those only which promised obedience in spirituals. What more than this could be asked by any reasonable man, for the final settlement of the question? The Catholic bishops of the United States, with the express sanction of Rome, take the oath, as thus modified; and they have more than once officially declared, both individually and in their collective capacity, their solemn belief that the Roman Pontiff has none but spiritual power and jurisdiction, outside of his own immediate states. The first Catholic bishop of the country—the venerable Carroll, of Baltimore,[2]— wrote as follows on this subject, in a Pastoral Letter issued February 22, 1797:[3]

"There would indeed be a foundation for the reproach intended by the words *foreign jurisdiction*, if we acknowledged in the successor of St. Peter any power or prerogative, which clashed in the least degree with the duty we owe to our country or its laws. To our country we owe allegiance and the tender of our best services and property, when they are necessary for its defense; to the Vicar of Christ we owe obedience in things *purely spiritual*. Happily, there is no competition in their respective claims on us, nor any difficulty in rendering to both the submission which they have a right to claim. Our country commands, and enforces by outward coercion, the services which tend to the preservation and defense of that personal security, and of that property, for the sake of which political societies were formed, and men agreed to live under the protection of, and in obedience to civil government. The Vicar of Christ, as visible head of His Church, watches over the integrity and soundness of doctrine, and makes use of means and weapons that act only on the souls of men, to enforce the duties of religion, the purity of worship, and ecclesiastical discipline."

---

[1] Mr. Pitt made inquiries on this subject at the Catholic universities of the Sorbonne, Louvain; Douay, Alcala, and Salamanca. Their answers were all distinct and unanimous, as follows:

I. That the Pope or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, has not, nor have, any civil authority power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever, within the realm of England.

II. That the Pope, or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, cannot absolve or dispense with his Majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever.

III. That there is no principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transactions, either of a public or a private nature.

See the documents, at greater length, in Butler's Book of the Church, Appendix I, p. 287–8.

[2] It may not be generally known, that Dr Franklin, when minister to France, had several conferences with the Nuncio of the Pope on the subject of having a Catholic bishop appointed for America; that he approved of the plan, in order that American Catholics might not be dependent on an English bishop; and that he recommended for the post Dr. Carroll, his friend and companion in the mission to Canada.

[3] Biographical Sketch, &c., *sup. cit.* P. 187–8.

Our bishops, assembled in solemn council at Baltimore, have often publicly proclaimed principles identical with those just announced, as emanating from the venerable founder of our hierarchy. We can make room for but two extracts, the first of which is taken from a Pastoral Letter issued by them in the sixth provincial council of Baltimore, held in May, 1846; from which it will be seen that our bishops, in their collective and official capacity, are very plain and explicit in their declarations on this very point:

"The paternal authority of the chief Bishop is constantly misrepresented and assailed by the adversaries of our holy religion, especially in this country, and is viewed with suspicion even by some who acknowledge its powerful influence in preserving faith and unity. It is unnecessary for us to tell you, brethren, that the kingdom of Christ, of which the Bishop of Rome, as successor of Peter, has received the keys, is not of this world; and that the obedience due to the Vicar of the Saviour is in no way inconsistent with your civil allegiance, your social duties as citizens, or your rights as men. We can confidently appeal to the whole tenor of our instructions, not only in our public addresses, but in our most confidential communications, and you can bear witness that we have always taught you to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, to God the things which are God's. Be not, then, heedful of the misrepresentations of foolish men, who, unable to combat the evidences of our faith, seek to excite unjust prejudice against that authority which has always proved its firmest support. Continue to practise justice and charity towards all your fellow-citizens—respect the magistrates—observe the laws—shun tumult and disorder, as free, and not as having liberty as a cloak for malice, but as the servants of God. You, brethren, have been called unto liberty: only make not liberty an occasion to the flesh, but by charity of the spirit, serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Thus you will put to shame the calumniators of our holy faith, and vindicate it more effectually, than by any abstract profession or disclaimer."

But there is another declaration, made by the bishops who composed the fifth council of Baltimore, held in May, 1843, which has even more weight in settling this question; because it occurs in an official Letter addressed to the Pope by the assembled American prelates. The Pontiff, far from being offended at so explicit a disavowal by the American bishops of all papal authority and jurisdiction in merely civil matters, says in his official answer: "Your letter was most pleasing to us;"[1] and he praises the zeal of our prelates. Here is the extract alluded to; — the bishops are speaking of the efforts made by our enemies to put down the Church in this country:

---

[1] Gratissimæ Nobis fuere Vestræ Literæ.

> "They spread doubtful rumors against us among the people; with untiring efforts, they circulate among the ignorant and uninformed books, which calumniate our most holy religion; they leave no means untried to infect with their errors their Catholic servants; and . . . although our forefathers poured out their blood like water for the defense of our liberties against a *Protestant* oppressor, they yet seek to render us, their fellow citizens, suspected by, and odious to the government, *by falsely asserting that we are reduced to servitude under the civil and political jurisdiction of a foreign prince, namely of the Roman Pontiff, and that we are therefore unfaithful to the republic!*"[1]

But did not the Popes formerly claim the right of deposing princes, and of absolving their subjects from the oath of allegiance? They certainly did; and so did we claim the same right, when we deposed George III., and declared ourselves "absolved" from our oath of allegiance to him: and as our claim was assuredly nothing against liberty, but all for liberty, so was also that of the Popes. In every instance of its exercise, known to us, the Popes struck a blow at tyranny, and one, at the same time, for the security and liberty of an oppressed people. Instead of blaming, we should rather applaud them, for thus keeping alive, amidst political darkness and confusion, that spark of popular liberty, which was destined, a little later, to illumine the political horizon of Europe. That the friends of European monarchs should object to this papal claim, we can readily understand, because its exercise was necessarily directed against their tyranny; but we cannot so easily explain the opposition to it manifested by our modern advocates of free principles. Yet the monarchists of Europe, along with Mr. Pitt, have long since been fully satisfied on this point; whereas our shrewder republicans have just begun to open their eyes to the awful danger to our freedom growing out of a claim, no longer advanced even by the Popes themselves!

Having in the following pages devoted a special Essay to the examination of the historical facts connected with the first exercise of the deposing power by a Roman Pontiff, we must refer our readers to it for full details on the subject.[2] Suffice it to say here, that the circumstances under which this extraordinary power was first claimed having long since ceased, the

---

[1] "Dubias contra nos in vulgus voces spargunt, libros qui calumniantur sanctissimam nostram religionem omni nisu apud rudes ignarosque divulgant; servos suos Catholicos hæresum suarum veneno ut inficiant nihil intactum relinquunt; patremque suum qui ab initio mendax fuit imitantes, nos Catholicos concives suos, quamvis patres nostri sanguinem suum tanquam aquam profuderint pro vindicatione libertatis contra oppressorem acatholicum, gubernio suspectos obnoxiosque reddere utpote, ut falso asserunt, sub alieni principis, Pontificis sc. Romani ditione politica et civili in servitutem redactos, ideoque reipublicæ infidos." Concilia Baltimor., p. 223.

[2] See Article VIII, Gregory VII. and his Age—the Deposing Power, P. 152 seqq.

Popes have, for nearly three centuries, virtually abandoned the claim, by making no attempt at its exercise.

With a view to show that the influence of the Catholic Church tends to debase its members, our adversaries direct attention to the material condition of those countries which have continued faithful to the ancient religion, and upon which the light of the reformation has never dawned. These, they say, are very far inferior to the neighboring Protestant communities in thrift, in literature, in morals, in liberty, and especially in material and social improvement; and this inferiority they trace to the difference of religious influence. We answer, by denying both the fact as stated, and the inference thence drawn. Abundant evidence can be alleged to show, that, if in some respects Protestant are superior to Catholic nations, in others the latter far surpass the former; and that, in both cases, a difference of religious principles has much less to do with the matter than is commonly believed by those opposed to Catholicity. As, however, we devote six articles in the following collection to a somewhat detailed comparison of the two classes of countries in question, we will be excused from entering at present into the investigation; content with referring those who may be curious to examine the evidence, as furnished even by impartial Protestant writers, to those papers.[1]

To those, again, who are in the habit of pointing, with a sneer, to the comparatively degraded condition of Mexico and South America, as a natural consequence of the Catholic religion there professed, we would beg to observe, that the masses of the population in Spanish and Portuguese America are either of pure Indian descent, or of mixed races; and that consequently, it is manifestly unreasonable to expect them to have attained to the same elevated social level as ourselves, who belong to the much boasted and loudly boasting Anglo-Saxon stock![2] As well might we expect to find our own high degree of civilization in the descendants of our North American Indians! There is this important difference between our policy and that of our Catholic neighbors, in regard to the treatment of the aboriginal inhabitants of this continent; that, whereas we have exterminated them or driven them out into the wilderness, they, on the contrary, have settled down in their midst, intermarried with them, taught them Christianity, and thus sought to raise them up in the social scale, even at the expense of lowering themselves. While they have met the aborigines half-way, and have been content to occupy with them a middle ground between a high and a low level of civilization, we, wrapped up in our inborn complacency, and vaunting our high social position as the necessary result of our "Anglo-Saxon blood," have looked with contempt upon the poor savages whom our fathers found in the country,—much as the proud Pharisee looked down upon the poor publican,—have disdained all sympathy for, or alliance with them, and have caused them to melt away before our advancing and exclusive civilization, as the snow melts away before the solar rays! The comparison between us and our Catholic neighbors may excite our complacency, and flatter our pride; it says but little for our humanity, and less still for our religious zeal or Christian charity. Our Protestant fellow citizens would do well never to vaunt their superiority over their Mexican and South American brethren![1] American Catholics, on the contrary, have reason to be proud of the Catholic colonists who explored and peopled our continent.[2]

---

[1] Entitled—Catholic and Protestant Countries—P. 454, seqq. In these articles our reasoning and illustrations are based chiefly on Protestant testimony.

[2] Not unmixed, however; for we have a strong infusion of the Celtic blood.

To awaken suspicion against the Catholic priesthood, the public prints have long been circulating among the people the extraordinary assertion, that Lafayette warned American patriots against priestly influence, in the following language: "If ever the liberty of the United States is destroyed, it will be by Romish priests." The fact of such a declaration coming from one who was a Catholic himself, if he was anything, bears the stamp of very great intrinsic improbability, to say the least, on its face; yet it passed current for truth, and was, we think, generally believed by the masses, who are prepared to devour any absurdity, provided it militate against Catholics. Now, what will the impartial public think, should it be ascertained, that this charge, like most others which have been lately circulated in this country to our disadvantage, is not only utterly groundless, but is directly the reverse of truth? Yet this is the case, if we may rely on the genuineness of the following extract from a letter of the French patriot, purporting to have been written by him to a gentleman in New York, in 1829, and which has been credited and pretty widely published by a portion of the secular press.[3] As it seems to be authentic, we republish it, as we find it in circulation:

"The friendly expressions of regard for my health and happiness conveyed in your kind letter to me of the 15th ultimo, I beg you to be assured, are grateful to my feelings: and I shall cherish the recollection of the many services and kindnesses towards me, on the part of both yourself and lady, while I was your guest in America, as among the most pleasing reminisences connected with my late visit to the United States. . . . I cannot but admire your noble sentiments of devotion and attachment to your country and its institutions. But I must be permitted to assure you that the fears which in your patriotic zeal you seem to entertain,—that *if ever the liberty of the United States is destroyed, it will be by Romish priests,*—are certainly without any shadow of foundation whatever. An intimate acquaintance of more than half a century with the prominent and influential priests and members of that Church, both in Europe and America, warrants me in assuring you, that you need entertain no apprehension of danger to your republican institutions from that quarter."

---

[1] We treat this subject in full in our review of Webster's Bunker Hill Speech; p. 383, seqq.

[2] For more on the subject, see the two papers reviewing Prescott's Conquest of Mexico, p. 250, seqq., and the three articles on Early Catholic Missions in the North-West. p 298, seqq.

[3] Published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of Oct. 1, 1854, in the Louisville Times of Oct. 4, 1854, and in other Journals. See note a, P. lxi, at the end of this Address.

But we are farther told, that Catholics in this country stand aloof from their Protestant fellow-citizens, and form a virtually separate society, having neither feelings nor interests in common with others; that they do not unite, at least cordially, with the rest of the community in carrying out our system of common schools; and that they cast their vote in a body for a particular political party. Let us briefly examine each of these three heads of accusation.

1. If the charge of our forming a separate community, with separate feelings and interests, refer to our religious organization and principles, we must plead guilty; it is surely not our fault, but our privilege, to differ on religious matters with such of our fellow-citizens as belong either to no religious communion whatever, or are members of the various conflicting sects which exist among us. We cheerfully allow to them the right of thinking and acting for themselves in matters of religion without molestation, and they should surely grant us the same freedom:—Hanc veniam petimus, damusque vicissim. This privilege should be the more cheerfully accorded to us, as we propose no innovation, but merely claim the right of walking, as our forefathers, as well as the ancestors of our accusers themselves walked, and went to heaven, for fifteen hundred years, before the world was blessed or cursed with this Babel-like confusion of tongues in the matter of religion.

If the accusation be meant to imply, that we are a separate *civil* community, and that, as citizens, we have feelings and interests different from those of others, we repel the charge as an injurious slander. Catholics cordially participate in all our civic anniversary festivals; they pray in their churches for all their fellow citizens, and for the permanent prosperity of this free government;[1] they nobly fight the battles of the country, and they are as willing to shed their blood in its defense or for its honor, as any of their brethren. In a word, they yield to none in patriotism and valor. About one-half of our regular army—if not even a larger proportion — is composed of Roman Catholic soldiers; a large number of the sailors and marines, attached to our young but vigorous navy, are also Catholics; and our chief officers in both arms of the service have often praised their fidelity to our flag, and their unfaltering courage in the hour of danger. In every battle-field of our country, — in the two wars against *Protestant* England, as well as in the late war against *Catholic* Mexico, — Catholics have freely bled, by the side of their Protestant fellow citizens, for the honor and triumph of our country.

---

[1] The beautiful prayer, for the "Ruling Powers," composed by Archbishop Carroll, is frequently read in our churches.

After the death of General Washington, bishop Carroll pronounced a splendid eulogy on his character, in the cathedral of Baltimore;[1] and after the battle of New Orleans, General Jackson was received in triumph in the Catholic cathedral, the laurel garland of victory, woven by Catholic hands, was placed on his brow by a Catholic priest; and the noble hero might be seen weeping with joyful emotion, as he listened and responded to the eloquent and patriotic address delivered on the occasion by the Rev. M. Dubourg. In a beautiful address delivered in Washington by Mr. Livingston, on the anniversary of the battle of New Orleans, the distinguished orator feelingly alluded to the pavement of the church being worn by the holy knees of the Ursuline nuns, praying fervently that victory might perch on the American banner, and drawing from the feast of the day — that of St. Victoria — an omen of success! We repeat it, the charge, understood in this sense, is a base calumny.

2. But we are not friendly to the common schools. Our answer is at hand. Let the Protestant majority, in this free country, make those schools such as not to wound the religious feelings, nor endanger the religious faith of our children, and then may they, with some show of reason, taunt us with not cheerfully uniting in patronizing them. Let them remove from them all sectarian books, all sectarian influences, all teachers who abuse their position for purposes of proselytism; let them not force upon our children the reading of a version of the Bible, which, in common with four-fifths of Christendom, we consider neither a genuine nor a complete rendering of the divine word:[2] — and then they will make it not only our interest, but our pleasure to unite with them in supporting the common schools. It will be our interest; for, in common with our fellow citizens, we pay our taxes for the erection and maintenance of

---

[1] This solid and noble oration is published in full in the "Biographical Sketch of Archbishop Carroll," above quoted, 158, seqq. The panegyric, by one who knew so well the Father of his country, produced a profound sensation at the time it was delivered.

[2] And with which a large and influential portion of the Protestant community in this country is so far dissatisfied, as to have taken steps already for issuing a new and different version, more conformable to their own views.

those schools; and if we do not patronize them, we have to incur the enormous additional expense of erecting separate schools for our own children, and are thus double taxed for educational purposes. The motive which would prompt us to make so great a sacrifice must be indeed a very strong one; and it is really we who have the best right to complain, not the Protestant majority which enforces such a hardship upon us. If we could conscientiously do it, we have every possible motive to patronize the common schools; but we hold that is is better far to suffer every earthly loss, than to jeopardize our faith, or that of our children. Life is short, eternity never ending; and "what doth it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"[1]

In countries much less free than ours, the common school system is so organized, that Catholics and Protestants have separate schools. Austria, with all her alleged tyranny, and with her triumphant Catholic majority of population, freely grants separate schools, supported out of the common fund, to the Protestant minority.[2] England, with all her hereditary hatred of Catholicity, permits the Catholics to have their own separate schools; and this is not found to conflict in practice with her common school system. Lower Canada, with its immense Catholic majority, freely concedes the privilege of separate schools to the small Protestant minority; and every one who reads the public prints must be familiar with the controversy, which is now carried on in Canada, and even in the Canadian parliament, on the subject of having this same equitable provision extended, in all its privileges, to the Catholic minority of Upper Canada. Strange, that Catholics, when in power, should be so liberal in granting a privilege, which a Protestant majority is so slow to concede![3]

Why should the freest country on the face of the earth form an exception, and be in fact the most exacting and tyrannical of all, in this matter of education? Can it be, that the immense Protestant majority in this country is apprehensive of the influence, which, in the case of this equitable provision being adopted, would be exercised by the small Catholic minority? Or are they afraid of entering the lists of free competition with their Catholic fellow-citizens? While all other pursuits are left open to honest emulation, and the rivalry does good to all, why should education alone be trammeled, by being made a state monopoly?

---

[1] St. Matthew xvi.

[2] See Article II. on Catholic and Protestant Countries, for the *Protestant* authority sustaining this assertion. Infra. P. 485,seqq. We believe that this is also, at least substantially, the case in Catholic Bavaria, as well as in Catholic France and Belgium; at any rate we hear of nc complaints made by Protestants on the subject, in regard to these or other Catholic countries, where Protestants exist as a resident body.

[3] See late Canadian papers, *passim.*

We are persuaded, that the provision for separate schools would greatly promote the permanency and prosperity of the common school system itself. It would destroy an odious restriction on parental rights, it would awaken a new energy in the cause of education, it would open new fields for generous rivalry; and, above all, it would render education much cheaper, and thereby lighten that heavy burden of taxation which is now weighing us down. It is a generally conceded fact, that Catholics can educate more cheaply than Protestants; and this may be one reason why the latter are not willing to hazard a free competition with the former. Grant separate schools, and our word for it, you will not have to pay much more than half the taxes you have been in the habit of disbursing for educational purposes. While we cheerfully submit to be guided by the principle of taxing the rich in order to educate the poor, — since under our present circumstances, it seems to be the only practicable means for effecting an object so desirable, — we naturally object, in common with all impartial and sensible men, to any excessive or unnecessary taxation.[1]

In Catholic times, no taxation whatever was necessary for educational purposes, especially for the education of the poor. Under the influence of Catholic charity and zeal for education, colleges and schools sprang up spontaneously in every part of Europe. These schools were FREE, in every sense of the word; no one was taxed to erect them, no one had to pay for entering them.[2] The first college, the first schools, and the first hospital, ever established on the North American continent, were erected by Catholics.[3] In all countries and in all ages, Catholics, and particularly the Catholic clergy, have been foremost in advancing the cause of popular education.[4]

It would be a subject of very useful inquiry, whether our common school system, as at present managed, be really conducive to a high tone of refinement, and to the development of sound morals, in the youth educated under its auspices. It is a Christian principle, of pretty general acceptance, that human nature is corrupt and more prone to evil than to good; and that consequently the religion of Christ is indispensably necessary for healing its evil tendency and causing it to walk in the path of virtue. The theory, which makes morality practicable, or even possible, without religion, is evidently more Pagan than Christian. If this be so, how can the children educated in our common schools be properly trained to sound morality, without a course of religious instruction, which the system excludes? To say, that sufficient religious knowledge for the purpose may be imparted, without what is called *Sectarian* teaching, seems to us wholly preposterous. To be adequate, the religious instruction should be detailed and practical, not general, vague, and theoretical; but the latter only can be compatible with our present school system, while the former could scarcely be carried out without trenching on forbidden ground. But let us look at the practical influence of the system, as exhibited in the general moral conduct of the youth educated in our common schools. Do these, in general, show, by their moral deportment, that they have been properly trained? Have they been taught politeness, respect for age, obedience to parents, morality in thought, word, and deed? We fear not. Our youth are growing more and more licentious and demoralized, with each succeeding generation; our boys particularly become men before they are half grown; they have learned all else better, than the art of governing their passions. The late fearful increase of crime, especially in our cities and towns, is a sad proof of this increasing demoralization. To what an abyss of vice are we hastening! There must be something sadly wrong somewhere.

---

[1] It is generally known, that what is undertaken and executed by the state usually costs much more money than what is done by individuals; and the same may be said of works carried on by corporations.

[2] See, for details, the Article on Schools and Universities in the "Dark" Ages, P. 118, seqq.

[3] See the Articles on Catholic Missions in the North West; First Paper, P. 298, seqq. Also the papers on the Conquest of Mexico: sup. cit.

[4] See the Article — Literature and the Catholic Clergy, P. 96. Read also the Lecture on Literature and the Arts in the Middle Ages; P. 77, seqq.

3. But Catholics, especially those of foreign birth, vote together, and vote for a particular political party: the liberties of our country are therefore endangered from this constantly augmenting foreign influence. This charge is groundless, both in its facts and in its inferences. In the first place, our native born Catholics have been heretofore divided, almost equally, between the two leading political parties of the country; in the second place, though the large majority of the Catholics of foreign birth have been in the habit of voting with the democrats, yet they have been far from unanimous on the subject; in the third place, the number of Catholics in this country is now, and is likely to continue to be, much too insignificant to rule the country in one way or another, either for good or for evil.

The following candid and sensible remarks from the Boston Post, a political print of some standing, contains so much sound reasoning on this subject, based upon facts tending to show the glaring absurdity of the charge that "foreigners are taking the country," that we will be pardoned for republishing them entire:

"It is said that we shall be overrun with foreigners; that they will rise upon native citizens and overpower them; that Catholicism will prevail and deprive America of its liberties. These assertions have been reiterated so often that thousands really fear such results. Take the former apprehension, and let facts, so far as they bear on the question of physical force, say how groundless that fear is. In the first place, for the whole time we have been a nation, it is a fact that no such attempt has been made; and if it ever should be made, such is the admirable working of our institutions, that the rule of a mob is utterly out of the question. Permanent success, even where the foreign population outweighs the native population, is an impossibility; for the whole force of the country would at once be invoked to suppress such a rule. In the next place, consider the utter folly, want of foresight, and suicidal policy of such an attempt, if it should ever be made. Of our now thirty millions of population one million[1] only are from Ireland: of the thirty-eight thousand churches that the census of 1850 shows as being in the country, the Catholic are set down at one thousand two hundred and twenty-one; and of the eighty-seven millions of church property, the Catholics have nine millions. Now, cannot this immense preponderance of Protestantism and of Americanism take care of itself? Is it not perfectly preposterous to suppose for a moment that the Irish Catholics will ever attempt to 'rise,' as the phrase is, with such an enormous disparity against them? It is due, it is but bare justice, to our foreign population to say, that not only has there been no attempt at rising, but their conduct — save only in cases when heated by liquor or otherwise excited — has been almost invariably that of peaceable citizens, submissive to the laws. They have a right to have such a certificate, as to the past, to stand in their favor; and when we consider their position among us, we believe there is no more danger of their 'rising' than there is of the falling of the stars."

Much has been said and written of late years about the "foreign vote." Both parties, on the eve of elections, have been in the habit of courting "foreigners;" who have thus, against their own choice and will, been singled out from the rest of the community, and placed in a false and odious position, by political demagogues for their own vile purposes. That they have been thus severed from their fellow citizens, and insulted with the compliment of their influence as a separate body, has not been so much their fault, as it has been their misfortune. From the successful party they have generally received, — with a few honorable exceptions — little but coldness *after* the election; while from the party defeated, they have invariably received nothing but abuse and calumny. So they have been, without their own agency, placed between two fires, and have been caressed and outraged by turns. Any appeal made to them by politicians, in their character of religionists or foreigners, and not in that of American citizens, is manifestly an insult, whether so intended or not; and we trust that Catholics will always view such appeals in this light. Whenever it is question of state policy, they can have no interests different from those of their fellow citizens. The laws which will be good for the latter, will be good for them; at least they can live under any system of equal legislation which will suit the Protestant majority, with whom they cheerfully share all the burdens of the country.

---

[1] The number is probably greater; but this does not affect the argument.

The Catholic bishops and clergy of the country have discreetly stood aloof, and wisely abstained from exercising any influence in the exciting political contests which have successively arisen. We ourselves, though to the manor born, have never even voted on a political question; and we believe that most of our brother prelates and clergy have adopted the same prudent precaution; not surely through any want of interest in the country, but chiefly with a view to remove from the enemies of our Church the slightest pretext for slandering our religious character. The only influence, we have sought to bring to bear on the members of our communion, has been invariably in the interests of peace, of order, and of charity for all men, even for our most bitter enemies. Whenever we have had occasion to address our people on the eve of elections, we have counseled them to avoid all violence, to beware of being carried away by passion, to be temperate, to respect the feelings and principles of their opponents; and, in the exercise of their franchise as citizens, to vote conscientiously for the men and measures they might think most likely to advance the real and permanent interests of the republic. We defy any one to prove, that we have ever attempted to exercise any other influence than this. The contrary has been occasionally asserted by unprincipled demagogues, for political effect; but the accusation, like many others made in the heat of political contests, has in every instance turned out to be a grievous slander; which was scarcely believed at the time, even by those who were most busy in giving it circulation.

Never since the foundation of the republic has it been heard of, that the Catholic bishops or clergy have taken an active part in conducting the proceedings of political conventions, or in fomenting political excitement, in the name of the religion of peace and love. They are not, and never have been, either abolitionists or freesoilers, ultraists or politico-religious alarmists. Nor have they ever ventured, either collectively or individually, to address huge remonstrances to congress, threatening vengeance in the name of Almighty God, unless certain particular measures were passed or repealed! Never have they been heard brawling in the public streets and highways, haranguing in violent language the already excited populace, lashing their passions into fury, and openly exciting them to deeds of mob violence and bloodshed! Never have they been known to parade the Bible in noisy political processions, thus prostituting the holy book, which breathes naught but peace and good will towards all men, to the vile purposes of political faction and sectarian strife! Ministers of other denominations have done, or countenanced all these things; and we cheerfully leave to them all the glory, whether religious or political, which they can possibly derive from such a line of conduct.[1]

Catholics of foreign birth are charged, in the same breath, with voting the democratic ticket, and with being the secret or open enemies of republican government! Is it then true, that a man cannot be a democrat, without being a traitor to his country? If so, then have the destinies of this great republic been ruled, with very slight intermission, for nearly thirty years by an organized band of traitors, consisting of the vast majority of our population! Catholics can well afford to be traitors in such goodly company. We are no politicians ourselves, and, so far as we have had any political leanings, they have heretofore been to the policy of the whigs; but, in common with every man of sound judgment and liberal mind, we reprobate the spirit, which would thus inconsistently and absurdly brand the advocates of different principles as enemies of the country and of all liberty. The genius of our noble constitution is in favor of allowing to every man the largest liberty of opinion in matters of state policy, without his thereby incurring the risk of having his motives questioned or his loyalty impeached. If any charge could be consistently made or sustained against this large portion of our Catholic population, it would be, on the contrary, that they have been generally in favor of too enlarged a liberty, to tally with the views of those who profess to belong to the conservative school; but to charge them with an intention to undermine our republic, is simply an absurdity, as glaring as it is malicious.

Those who are loudest in their denunciations of "foreigners" seem to forget what "foreigners" have done for the country. They have filled our army and navy; they have fought our battles; they have leveled our forests, peopled our vast unoccupied territory, and filled our cities with operatives and mechanics; they have dug our canals, built our turnpikes and railroads, and have thus promoted, more perhaps than any other class, the improvement of the country and the development of its vast resources; in a word, they have, in every way, largely contributed towards enhancing the wealth and increasing the prosperity of the republic. Do they deserve nothing but bitter denunciation and unsparing invective for all these services? Are they to be branded as aliens and traitors, for having thus effectually labored to serve their adopted country?

---

[1] It is also well known that, particularly during the late elections, Protestant ministers took an active part in the canvass. In several instances, they were even candidates for office, and in some cases elected. It is they, and not the Catholics, who have thus attempted to mingle religion with politics; and if ever there be brought about a union of Church and State in this republic, it will surely not be accomplished by Catholics, but by those precisely who are foremost in the crusade against them! Let the lovers of freedom look to it in time! The Protestant ministers may, in fact, be said to be at the head of the abolition party in the north.

But they are foreigners in feeling and in interest, and they still prefer their own nationality to ours. We answer first, that if this their alleged feeling be excessive, and if it tend to diminish their love for the country of their adoption, it is certainly in so far reprehensible; but where is the evidence that this is the case? Has their lingering love for the country of their birth, — with its glowing memories of early childhood and ripening manhood, of a mother's care and a sister's love, — interfered in aught with their new class of duties as American citizens? Has it prevented their sharing cheerfully in the burdens, in the labors, and in the perils of the country? We believe not. Instead of their being unconcerned and indifferent, their chief fault, in the eyes of their enemies, lies precisely in the opposite, — in their taking *too much* interest in the affairs of the republic. We answer, in the second place, that this natural feeling of love for the country of their birth, growing as it does out of that cherished and honorable sentiment which we denominate patriotism, will, in the very nature of things, gradually diminish under the influence of new associations, until it will finally be absorbed into the one homogeneous nationality; and thus the evil — if it be an evil — will remedy itself. The only thing which can possibly keep it alive for any considerable time, would be precisely the narrow and proscriptive policy, adopted in regard to citizens of foreign birth by the Know Nothings and their sympathizers. The endeavor to stifle this feeling by clamor and violence will but increase its intensity.

We answer thirdly, that the influence of Catholicity tends strongly to break down all barriers of separate nationalities, and to bring about a brotherhood of citizens, in which the love of our common country and of one another would absorb every sectional feeling. Catholicity is of no nation, of no language, of no people; she knows no geographical bounds; she breaks down all the walls of separation between race and race, and she looks alike upon every people, and tribe, and caste. Her views are as enlarged as the territory which she inhabits; and this is as wide as the world. Jew and gentile, Greek and barbarian; Irish, German, French, English, and American, are all alike to her. In this country, to which people of so many nations have flocked for shelter against the evils they endured at home, we have a striking illustration of this truly Catholic spirit of the Church. Germans, Irish, French, Italians, Spaniards, Poles, Hungarians, Hollanders, Belgians, English, Scotch, and Welch; differing in language, in national customs, in prejudices, — in every thing human, —are here brought together in the same Church, professing the same faith, and worshiping like brothers at the same altars! The evident tendency of this principle is, to level all sectional feelings and local prejudices, by enlarging the views of mankind, and thus to bring about harmony in society, based upon mutual forbearance and charity. And in fact, so far as the influence of our Church could be brought to bear upon the anomalous condition of society in America, it has been exercised for securing the desirable result of causing all its heterogeneous elements to be merged in the one variegated, but homogeneous nationality. Protestantism isolates and divides; Catholicity brings together and unites. Such have been the results of the two systems in times past; such, from their very nature, must be their influence on society at all times and in all places.

The character of the foreign immigration into this country has been undergoing a considerable change within the last few years; the German element now strongly predominates over the Irish, and perhaps the Protestant and infidel, over the Catholic. The disastrous issue of the revolutionary movements which convulsed all Europe in 1848–9, has thrown upon our shores masses of foreign political refugees, most of whom are infidels in religion,and red republicans, or destructionists of all social order, in politics. The greatest, and, in fact, the only real danger to the permanency of our republican institutions, is to be apprehended from this fast increasing class of foreigners, composed in general, of men of desperate character and fortune, —of outlaws from society, with the brand of infidelity upon their brow. Against the anarchical principles advocated by these men the Catholic Church takes open ground; and she feels honored by their bitter hostility. It could not be otherwise. Her principles are eminently conservative in all questions of religion and of civil polity; theirs are radical and destructive in both. Theirs is the old war of Satan against Christ; of the sons of Belial against the keepers of the law; of false and anti-social against true and rational liberty — "the liberty of the glory of the children of God."

If the lately organized secret political association warred against the pernicious principles maintained by such foreigners as these, we would not only have no cause to complain, but we would rather applaud their patriotic efforts in the cause of true freedom, and bid them God speed. But what is our astonishment to find, that our boasted advocates of "American principles," instead of opposing, secretly or openly sympathize with these sworn enemies of all religion and of all social order — of God and man; as well as with the reckless and blood-stained Irish Orangemen! Say what you will, their efforts are directed almost solely against the Catholic element in the foreign immigration, and chiefly against the Irish Catholics. Their professions are belied by their acts, all of which point to Catholicity, as the victim whose ruin is to be accomplished, at all hazards, in this *free* and *republican* country. What else is indicated by the bloody riots gotten up by hired street brawlers against the Irish Catholics; what else by the wrecking and burning of Catholic churches? If the true policy of the country demands a revision or repeal of the naturalization laws, then bring about this result by fair, consistent, and honorable means; set about it in an open and manly manner, as men, as Americans, as Christians, not as cowards fearing the light of day, and skulking beneath the cover of darkness. If a new policy in regard to foreign immigrants is to be adopted, or if even the alien and sedition laws are to be re-enacted, let the country know your purpose in time, that all the true lovers of freedom may be prepared for the issue.

But the Irish immigrants are vicious and immoral. That a portion of them have their faults, — grievous and glaring faults, — we do not deny; but all fair and impartial men will admit, that the charge made against them as a body is atrociously unjust. They have their faults, which are paraded and greatly exaggerated by the public press; but they have also their virtues, which are studiously kept out of view. They have their faults; but have not the corresponding classes in our own population their vices also, as great, as, if not greater than those of the class which is now singled out as the victims of a virtuous public indignation?[1] They have their vices, but these are often faults of the head more than of the heart; of imprudence and thoughtlessness, more than of deliberate design and malice. If you look for the accomplished forger, the cold-blooded midnight assassin or murderer, the daring burglar, the man who goes always armed with the destructive bowie-knife or revolver, ready for any deed of blood, you will, in general, have to seek elsewhere than among the class of Irish immigrants, whom you so fiercely denounce.

The Irishman's vices are generally the result of intemperance, or of the sudden heat of passion, sometimes aroused by outrages upon his country or religion; he is easily misled by evil associates, but his heart is generally in the right place. You can accomplish everything with him by mildness and persuasion; you can do nothing by overbearing harshness and reckless insult. The Irishman has no concealment in his character; what he is, he is openly and before the whole world; and this circumstance, together with the deadly hatred which has been lately awakened against his countrymen in this land of boasted freedom, may aid us in accounting for the singular fact, that so many Irish are arrested for real or alleged crimes, whereas so many of our natives, equally or more guilty, are permitted to go free! A riot occurs in one of our cities; the Irish get the worst of it; they are overpowered by superior numbers, are beaten and murdered; and in the end it turns out, that all those arrested are from the injured and outraged party themselves! The really guilty go free, the comparatively innocent are punished by the arm of the law.

---

[1] Besides, is no allowance to be made for them, in consequence of that grinding oppression with which Protestant England has crushed them for centuries? We doubt much whether any other people would have stood up so well under a tyranny so dreadful and so long continued. See the Article — Ireland and the Irish, p. 506 — sup. cit.

Those among them who fall into crime have been already, in most instances, estranged from their Church by the influence of dangerous associations, often with the depraved portion of our own native population. They go not to the Church; they hear or heed not the voice of their pastors; they do not approach the sacraments; they are Catholics only in name, if even they retain the name. Whose fault is it, that they are thus estranged and corrupted? Not surely the fault of the Church, which seeks to reclaim and to save them. How can the pastors of the Church be held responsible for the misconduct of those who will not even hear their voice, or consent to be brought under the saving influence of the religion which they inculcate? Of all the charges which have been lately made against the Catholic Church, the most glaringly unjust is that, which ascribes the immorality of a certain class, amongst those who may still call themselves Catholics, to the disastrous influence which she exercises over their minds. These unfortunate men are thus seduced into habits of crime by evil influences acting entirely *outside* the Church, and then their crimes are laid at the door of the Church itself, which they have been induced practically to abandon! Was there ever iniquity greater than this?

The Church weeps, like a tender mother, over the sins of her children; she employs every kind and tender influence to win them back to virtue; she goes after them in their wanderings, as the Good Shepherd after the strayed sheep; she has no word of reproach or railing to frighten them farther away from the fold; with earnest and unfaltering love, she seeks to reclaim them from their errors; no poverty, no misery however squalid or loathsome, no disease however infectious deters her from persuing her cherished work of mercy: and if she succeeds in her mission, her heart overflows with unspeakable joy and gladness, and she bears them back with maternal affection to her sanctuary, and lays them tenderly and joyously at the foot of her altars, as noble trophies of her labor of love. Her ministers labor day and night for the spiritual welfare of their people; they wear out their health, and grow prematurely old in assiduous toil among the poor and lowly; they often lay down their lives for their flocks. And if their zeal is not always crowned with success, if scandals still abound, in spite of their exertions to promote virtue, the unfortunate result is surely not owing to their fault, because clearly beyond their control.

The Church fails not at all times earnestly to inculcate on her children the duty of being good citizens of this republic, and of sincerely loving, and praying for *all* their fellow-citizens, even those who hate and revile them. She often addresses them in language similar to that, which was lately employed by one of our first prelates in age, learning, piety, and station,—Dr. Kenrick, the Archbishop of Baltimore,—the first episcopal see in the country. We cannot better conclude this Address than with an extract from his recent Pastoral Letter; and we are quite sure that every bishop, every priest, and every layman of our Church in this country will cheerfully subscribe to every sentiment and to every word therein contained:

> "We take this occasion, brethren, to recommend to your most earnest prayers the peace, prosperity, and happiness of these United States, and of all our fellow-citizens. It is not our province, as pastors of the Church, to meddle with political interests: but it is our duty to exhort you to continue faithful to the constitution and government under which you have the happiness to live, obedient to the laws, respectful to all the civil authorities, and to prove yourselves by your conduct peaceful and orderly citizens. Be not concerned at the suspicions cast on your loyalty and patriotism, and the efforts made to proscribe you, and check the progress of our holy religion. 'Who is he that can hurt you, if you be zealous of good? But if, also, you suffer any thing for justice sake, blessed are ye. And be not afraid of their fear, and be not troubled. But sanctify the Lord Christ in your hearts.' Pursue, then, the peaceful path of industry, regardless of political partizanship; shun the use of intoxicating liquors; avoid secret societies; practise your religion; teach it to your children; take every opportunity to perform kind offices towards your fellow-citizens, whatever wrongs you may endure, and pray that God may lead all to the knowledge of the truth. This course of conduct is your best defense—your only security, whilst it will vindicate most effectually the honor of the Church. Keep far away from scenes of danger; from tumult and bloody strife. In the retirement of your chambers, and at the foot of the altar, pour out your hearts in prayer, that God may turn away

His anger and in the day of His just visitation may remember mercy. Implore Him to relieve our country from pestilence, which now strews the land with victims, from the disorders of the elements which spread terror and destruction,—but, above all, from the maddening influence of the demon of civil discord. Ask Him to continue and perpetuate those free institutions, which have hitherto united in social brotherhood and concord the millions of men of various nations and creeds, that, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, bask in the sunshine of liberty. Pray that to all may be imparted the still greater blessings of faith and love, that we may with one heart and mouth glorify God and fulfill his law, in order to our salvation."

(Note a.)

Lafayette's Letter.—The testimony of Professor Morse is sometimes alleged as evidence of a contrary saying by Lafayette. But so far as we have seen the Professor's statement, it does not denounce this letter of Lafayette as a forgery, though it alleges what might be deemed inconsistent with its contents. An elaborate refutation of it appeared some time ago in the New York Freeman's Journal; and if the Professor answered the strong, if not conclusive arguments therein contained, and published *under his own eye*, we have not seen or heard of his reply. We will give a few reasons to show why we believe that the statement of Mr. Morse is wholly unsatisfactory and unreliable. He was, and perhaps is still, a man of strong religious prejudices against the Catholic Church; and every one knows how far religious bigotry may warp the judgment of men otherwise estimable. His statement is based upon a recollection of *oral* interviews with Lafayette, held several years previously; and all know how easy it is in such cases to exaggerate or make mistakes, the narrator being but too apt to give to the sayings of his friend the coloring of his own prejudices. He says, indeed, that he received a letter on the subject from the French general, but he takes special care not to publish that letter, though its publication, if his account of its contents be correct, would have greatly corroborated his statement. He owes it to himself still to produce and publish that letter entire, and to *exhibit the original*, which he must have in his possession, if he received it at all. He furnishes no dates or specifications of his conversation with the French patriot; and though he says that similar declarations were made by him to "more than one American," he does not produce the testimony of even *one*, in verification of his statement. His testimony is, in fact, as vague and unsatisfactory as it could well be, and we doubt whether, at least in its present shape, it would be admitted as evidence in any court of Christendom. All this looks sufficiently suspicious; but there is yet another circumstance connected with the matter, which is still more so, and which greatly weakens, if it does not wholly destroy, the value of his testimony. His statement was made only in October, 1836, whereas Lafayette had died May 20, 1834,—*two years and five months previously!* Why this long delay, if Lafayette had it so much at heart—as the Professor declares—that Americans should be warned of their imminent danger from "Romish Priests?" Did he communicate with the patriot's long departed spirit by a species of spirit-rapping, or did he trust to a vague recollection of mere conversations held several years previously? Or did he wait *prudently*, until the Catholic hero was already long dead, that he might incur less risk of contradiction? What hypothesis will you adopt to explain this strange delay? Finally, the statement of Professor Morse, besides bearing the marks of the greatest intrinsic improbability, bordering on moral impossibility, was published at a time when the Maria Monk excitement was at its height in New York, and when it was fashionable to receive, without much questioning, any statement, no matter how improbable, that might affect injuriously the Catholic Church or its members. The temporary success of the glaring Maria Monk impostures,—sustained as they were by such Reverend ministers of God as Brownlee, Bourne, Slocum, Hoyt, and others, until the base fabrication was triumphantly exposed, by Col. W. L. Stone, a distinguished Protestant editor of New York,—is a sufficient illustration of this mischievous and prurient spirit of pious fraud and easy credulity.

We close our remarks on this subject with the following dilemma: either Lafayette was a Catholic, or he was an infidel;—he certainly was not a Protestant. If a Catholic, he could not have originated the motto ascribed to him by Morse, without being a hypocrite,—which no one will venture to assert.[1] If an infidel, then his testimony against Catholics has no more weight than that of Voltaire and Tom Paine; and like them, he may have meant by *priests*, the ministers of *all Christian* denominations. Whichever horn of the dilemma our adversaries may choose to select, the Catholic Church still remains unscathed.

---

[1] That he died a Catholic, may be inferred from the fact, testified to us by an eye-witness, that he was solemnly interred with all the rites of the Catholic Church.

PART I.

HISTORICAL.

Reviews, Essays, and Lectures.

PART I.—HISTORICAL.

I. CHURCH HISTORY.*

ARTICLE I.—THE EARLY AGES.

Palma and Palmer as historians — Rome and Oxford — Gratuitous assertions — Promises of Christ in favor of the Church — Essential and Non-essential doctrines — Bishop Whittingham — Puseyism — Palmer's division — Purity of early Church — The Age of persecution — Donatists — Striking avowal — Peter in Rome — The "Thundering Legion" — *Disciplina arcani* — Testimonies of Sts. Ignatius and Justin on holy Eucharist — Cases of Popes Victor and Stephen — The Primacy — St. Irenaeus — The Cross of Constantine — Early heresies — Church of Rome — Story of Liberius and of Honorius I. — Monastic Life — Holy Virginity — Nestorius — St. Cyril of Alexandria — St. Patrick — Early British Churches — Primitive Irish Churches — St Simeon Stylites — "Rank Popery" — Early "abuses and corruptions" — Wisdom of the Church — The Seventh and Eighth General Councils.

We notice together the ecclesiastical histories of Professors Palmer and Palma, not on account of the similarity in name of the two distinguished authors, but for other obvious reasons. They have both lately given to the world the results of their respective labors in a very interesting department of human inquiry. Both, though in very different ways, have attempted to trace the various phases and vicissitudes which mark the history of the Church of Christ. Both too are men of distinguished ability and learning.

They belong to two different, and we may say opposite schools;—those of Rome and Oxford; though the latter not long since manifested some disposition to approximate to the former. And they are tolerably good representatives of these two schools. The Roman Palma, as a historian, has a character distinct in its outline and clearly marked in all its features; with a decided and unfaltering step he boldly treads the path of antiquity, with all the tortuous windings of which he is thoroughly acquainted. The Oxford Palmer is less decided in his historical character; though he betrays no lack of confidence in his assertions,—else he were not a *genuine* Englishman,—yet he appears to pursue the ancient path with the uncertain air of one who hesitates, and is not well acquainted with the road. As the French would say, he is evidently *géné;*[1] he appears like a stranger in a foreign country, who would fain act as though he were at home. He belongs to a school which has manifestly been for too short a time in the remote land of antiquity, to have become naturalized to its climate, or well acquainted with its rich productions.

---

* I. A compendious Ecclesiastical History, from the earliest period to the present time. By the Rev. William Palmer, M. A., of Worcester College, Oxford; author of *Origines Liturgicæ*, &c., &c. With a Preface and Notes by an American Editor. New York, 1841. 1 vol. 12mo. pp. 228.

II. Prælectiones Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ, quas in Collegio Urbano Sacræ Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, et in Pontificio Seminario Romano habuit Joannes Baptista Palma, Sacerdos Romanus, Hist. Eccles. Professor. Tomi IV, 8vo. Romæ, 1838 — 1840.

(Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, delivered in the Urban College of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, and in the Pontifical Seminary of Rome; by John Baptist Palma, a Roman Priest, Professor of Ecclesiastical History.

Nor does the contrast stop here. The two professors meet indeed on the common field of Church History, yet do they pursue routes so different, as seldom to come in contact with each other. The Roman bears "the labor of the day and the heat;" he turns up the soil, waters it with the sweat of his brow, and cultivates it with untiring industry. The Oxfordite skims lightly over its surface; gambols about its borders, culling a flower here, and plucking a fruit there; and, for the amusement or gratification of his readers, we apprehend, he often trips, falls, or turns somersets!

Dropping the figure, the Roman professor enters critically into his subject; he gives us both sides of every question which he handles; he furnishes his authorities as he proceeds; he states and refutes objections, ancient and modern: and when you have read his history, you are compelled to say, either that he has reason on his side, or at least, that his views and statements are very plausible. The Oxfordite is far from entering on any such dull and plodding labor. He would seem to consider it a bootless toil. Except scriptural quotations, and one reference to his own works, and another to the authority of the Protestant archbishop Usher, he does not, we believe, give us one single reference from the beginning to the end of his work! He furnishes many passages from the ancient documents, but he does not tell us once whence they are taken; and unless his readers are so conversant with those writings, as to be able to hunt up and examine his quotations for themselves, they must wholly rely on his bare word for their genuineness and accuracy.

This is a most serious defect. Nor let it be alleged, that such learned references are out of place in a work avowedly intended for popular use. In such books, they are perhaps more requisite than in any other, for the reason just assigned. Without some such guide, the unlearned are left wholly at the mercy of every smatterer and theorizer, who may choose to embody his peculiar views in the form of history. And this is unhappily but too often the case in popular works, especially in those written in the English language to suit the palate of Protestant readers. Of no book, perhaps, is it more true than of Palmer's Church History. If any one ever *needed* proofs in support of his assertions, he surely does, as we hope abundantly to show in the sequel.

[1] Constrained — ill at ease.

For our own part, we would not give a rush for the statements of any mere partisan historian, unless they be confirmed by constant references to the original authorities. We like to have chapter and verse for every thing. We value those historical books only, the margins of which are filled with quotations of the proper documents, and the writers of which give sufficient evidence that they have not taken these authorities at second hand, but have drunk deeply themselves at the fountain heads. We like books written after the manner of Lingard's History of England. There is at least some satisfaction in reading such works. One feels that he has a guide, which he can consult in an emergency. But when there is nothing to depend on, but the mere assertions of a flippant writer, who is evidently not unbiased in his views, every impartial judge must receive such statements with distrust. They are somewhat like the tedious and over-colored narratives of a traveler, who retails his "first impressions" of a foreign country entirely from memory. They have not the weight, and they merit not the name of real history. We make these general remarks, because, as we shall see, they are fully applicable to the work of Palmer, and because in this age of specious historical theories, pompously styling themselves *philosophies of history*, one cannot be too guarded in relation to the statements he is called on to credit.

It will be easily gathered from what we have thus far said, that in comparing the Oxford Palmer with the Roman Palma, we are compelled to award the *palm* to the latter. Here we have at least one genuine *Roman* priest. All who were acquainted with him could not fail to mark his great erudition, his moderation and modesty in his statements, and his extensive learning and research. For more than twenty years, he was a distinguished professor of Church History in two of the twenty-four great colleges of Rome.[1] He became gray in this delightful study. It grew to be identified with his very being, and it was almost the idol of his devotion. He thoroughly examined all the original documents which he cites; and this minute and critical knowledge of antiquity appears on every page of his work. This learned erudition is, in fact, a distinctive characteristic of Italian writers generally; as the contrary feature,—that of superficial flippancy,—is distinctive of most English writers, and of few more so than of Palmer.

Our chief object, in this paper, is to present a summary review of the Compendious Ecclesiastical History by the Oxford Professor. But our limits will allow us merely to touch very briefly on the chief character of the work. To examine all the historian's statements, to supply all his omissions, and to correct all his errors, would require a volume much larger than the one he has given to the world. As he gives no proof whatever for anything he asserts, we would be justified in repelling gratuitous assertion, by mere denial without proof. This would be in accordance with the well-known aphorism: *quod gratis asseritur gratis negatur* — "what is asserted gratuitously may be denied gratuitously." But we will do a Catholic work of supererogation, and supply proof as we proceed; at least as far as our limits will possibly allow.

---

[1] He became afterwards Latin Secretary of the present sovereign Pontiff, and in the disgraceful attack on the papal palace which followed the assassination of the late Count Rossi, he was shot dead by one of the assassins, almost by the side of his illustrious sovereign.

We would not be understood as condemning indiscriminately the history of Professor Palmer. The book has many good qualities, which we greatly admire. We have been much pleased with its general plan and scope, and with the division into epochs, with, however, one exception, to which reference will soon be made. The chief excellence with which we were struck, is a certain pious vein which pervades the work, sustained by appropriate and select examples of ancient sanctity. In this feature we are delighted to recognize no little of the true Catholic spirit.

He lays down the plan of his work in the first, or introductory chapter. He says:

> "The history of the Church, then, is not like other histories, in which the progress and fate of human enterprises is (*are?*) described; it is the fulfillment of God's will for the salvation of man, the accomplishment of prophecies, the triumph of grace over the imperfection and sins of nature. The perpetuity of the Church, its propagation in all nations, the succession of the true faith, the manifestation of the Holy Spirit's assistance in the lives of Christians; the calamities, errors, afflictions, which, in all ages, beset it—afford new proofs of Christianity itself, and inspire the devout mind with humility and faith." [1]

In another place, he says:

> "The promises of our Lord to his Disciples, that the Spirit of Truth should lead them into all truth, and abide with them forever, that the gates of hell should not prevail against his Church, and that he himself would be always with his Disciples—imply that the faith revealed by Jesus Christ should, in every age, continue to purify and sanctify the hearts and lives of his real followers; and we may hence infer that the belief which has, *in all ages*, been derived by the Church from the holy Scriptures; the great truths which Christians have always unanimously held to be essential to the Christian profession; which have supported them under the tortures of martyrdom, and transformed them from sin to righteousness; that such doctrines are, without doubt, the very same which God himself revealed for the salvation of man." [2]

From the solemn promises of Christ just alluded to, we would infer more than suited the purpose of the Oxford divine. We would infer that the belief which was held in all ages of the Church as the revelation of God, *was* derived from, or conformable to, the holy Scriptures. If the Church, in her official capacity, could be mistaken in the understanding of the Scriptures, then were all the solemn promises of Christ of no avail, and utterly nugatory. The question would constantly recur —did the Church *actually* derive such and such doctrines from the written Word of God? And if private judgment said she did not, the principle implied by Dr. Palmer above would require that such tenets

[1] Introduction, p. 4.

[2] Pp. 10, 11, chap. ii.

should be rejected. He thus upsets with one hand, what he had built up with the other! Consistency is a jewel, which sparkles only on the brow of truth.

There is also, it seems to us, in the above passage, an implied assertion of the hackneyed distinction of Jurieu between essential and non-essential doctrines, the former of which must be received, and the latter may be rejected without sin. We utterly eschew this leveling principle, which opens wide the door to latitudinarianism and indifference in matters of religion. The Scriptures make no such distinction; Christ made none such, when he said: "He that believeth not, shall be condemned."[1] Whatever Christ taught and his apostles promulgated as doctrine, no matter how trivial it may seem to proud human wisdom, is equally essential to faith. Of the objects of faith, it is as true as it is of those of morals, that "he who offendeth in one is become guilty of all."[2]

We have remarked on these passages, because they afford a clue to the entire work. They exhibit the object and purpose of the writer in composing his history. And they lead us to suspect, what the perusal of the work clearly proves, that it is Church History set to Puseyism, or rather Puseyism set to Church History. The Professor started out with assuming his preconceived theory, half Catholic and half Protestant, and he consequently makes the facts of history bend to its maxims; hence his frequent blunders in point of fact, and hence the partisan spirit which evidently pervades his whole publication.

The history comes before the American reading community under the sanction and sponsorship of a distinguished individual,— no less a personage, we are given to understand, than the Right Reverend W. R. Whittingham, the Protestant Episcopal bishop of Maryland. He is the "American editor" who writes the preface and notes. We had been told, that Bishop Whittingham stood high among his brother religionists for his learning and ability. If such be the case, he has certainly given us a very poor specimen of both, in his office of American editor of Palmer. As we hope to prove hereafter, the work would have been much more accurate without his notes; and it would even have suffered very little from the omission of his preface. The notes are, almost without an exception, grossly inaccurate in point of fact; they are, in general, an attempt either to falsify the true statements of Palmer, or to make bad worse. And, like this author, he too would have us believe him on his bare word!

In his preface, he thus indorses the statements of the Oxford historian:

> "A great degree of accuracy in general outline and in minute detail wherever that is given, is another admirable characteristic of Mr. Palmer's work. It has been increased, perhaps (*perhaps!*), by the correction of one or two slips of a hasty pen, in this edition; and the minute differences, of statement or opinion, in some of the editor's additional notes, will show how thoroughly he shared in the author's anxiety to be

---

[1] St. Mark, xvi.

[2] St. James, ii, 10.

really useful — an end to be attained, in a work like this, only by the most scrupulous adherence to truth. If error as to fact be found in the book now presented to the reader, it has escaped not only the attention of the learned and indefatigable author, but the close examination of his humble and grateful fellow-laborer."[1]

We scarcely know through what kind of glasses the Protestant bishop examined Prof. Palmer's book; but they certainly favored obliquity of vision. They were probably manufactured at Oxford, and partook of the doubtful character of most other things which have recently emanated from that city. The manufacturer must have age and experience in the business, before he can hope to produce articles of real merit. If the bishop will condescend to accept our offer, made in all courtesy and kindness, we will lend him a pair of glasses, of the real Roman grinding, without a single flaw; and we assure him that through them he will be enabled to see things aright, and in a new light altogether.

By means of these same glasses, we have, at the very first glance, been able to detect more than *fifty* egregious blunders in the work, including, of course, the famous notes, nearly all of which we have been constrained to put on our black list. These errors, many of them, regard important facts; and others consist of unfair statements, or of omissions in matters of vital consequence. The sun was thought to be without spots, until the Jesuit Scheiner, or the Catholic philosopher Galileo, proved their existence by means of the telescope. Dr. Palmer's book has even more spots than the sun, though Bishop Whittingham could not discover them. And no wonder, as the Oxford glasses which he used, mystify more, and are, therefore, less serviceable than even the naked eye!

Mr. Palmer divides his history into five epochs. We will give his own language, which contains the gist of his new Puseyite theory of Church History.

> "First, the ages of persecution which terminated with the accession of the Emperor Constantine to universal empire, in A. D. 320, and during which the Church was purest.
>
> "Secondly, the ages (A. D. 320 — 680) when heresies invaded the Church, and were repelled by the six holy œcumenical synods; and when the ravages of barbarians and heathens were counterbalanced by the conversion of many nations.
>
> "Thirdly, the period (680 — 1054) in which ignorance, worldliness, and superstition (!) began to fall thickly on the Church, though an earnest spirit of piety still continued to produce evangelists, saints, and martyrs, and to add wide regions to the Church of Christ.
>
> "Fourthly, the times (1054 — 1517) when the east and west were estranged by the ambition of the Roman Pontiffs (!); when those bishops, elevated to the summit of temporal and spiritual power in the west, introduced numberless corruptions and innovations (!); and when their power began to fade away. (!)
>
> "Fifthly, the epoch (1517 — 1839) when a reformation being called for, was resisted by those who ought to have promoted it (!); when the

---

[1] Preface, p. 9.

western Church became divided; and at length infidelity came to threaten universal destruction."[1]

Here are misstatements enough surely, especially under the three last epochs. But these apart, — of which more hereafter, — we are pleased with the division, with the exception of the second epoch, which is made, whimsically enough, to terminate at the sixth general council; these six councils being all that it suited Mr. Palmer's purpose to admit, out of at least *eighteen* such assemblies, which have equal claims with those to be general councils. But the others were far too *popish* to suit the fastidious Oxford palate!

For the sake of convenience, we will briefly run over these epochs, as they come in order of time, availing ourselves of the author's admissions, supplying *some* of his many omissions, and correcting a few of his more glaring blunders as we proceed. We could not correct all; nor even half, without re-writing his whole history. Nor do we intend in our rapid sketch to forget to pay our respects, as in duty bound, to Bishop Whittingham, the Right Reverend editor and annotator.

EPOCH I, A. D. 34 — 320.[2]

During this epoch, Professor Palmer tells us that "the Church was *purest*." We do not object to this term of praise, if it be meant only to imply, that Christians were then in general more fervent, more disengaged from the world, and more self-devoted and heroic. If it be meant to signify, that there were no moral disorders or heresies among the early Christians, or that the Church, as a Church, was then more pure in doctrine than subsequently, as would appear to be the historian's drift, then do we protest against the use of the term. The writings of the earliest fathers, and especially those of Tertullian and St. Cyprian,[3] abundantly prove, that even during the first three centuries, there were, as Christ had foretold there would be in all ages, grievous scandals to be deplored: while the five books of St. Irenæus "against heresies," and more especially the historical work of St. Epiphanius on the same subject, establish the fact, that then, as subsequently, the purity of the faith was repeatedly assailed. But the Church triumphed then, as afterwards, because Christ, her divine Spouse, had solemnly promised that she should triumph. We make these remarks, because Protestant writers, with a view to establish their preconceived theory of a defection of the Church in the fourth and following centuries, from the disorders which then occasionally prevailed, have been too much in the habit of concealing these incontestable facts, and of drawing a too highly colored picture of earlier purity.

This was emphatically a period of struggle and of persecution. The

---

[1] P. 5.

[2] Embraced in the first six chapters, from p. 1 to p. 34.

[3] In their respective treatises — *De Pœnitentia* and *De Lapsis*, and in their other works.

Church then passed through a fiery ordeal: for two hundred and fifty years the colossal power of the Roman empire was employed to crush her: the blood of her martyrs flowed like water; but like water it served to fertilize the earth! Christ triumphed in his spouse: his promises were redeemed; the "gates of hell did not prevail;" twelve poor fishermen conquered the world, and reared the cross on the proudest monuments of fallen Rome! The chief persecutors died a terrible death, so graphically painted by the eloquent Lactantius, in the fourth century.[1] Why did not our historian at least allude to this remarkable fact? His whole account in fact of the ten general persecutions,[2] is very meagre and imperfect, even for a compendious history. He, however, gives us in full the beautiful letter of the church of Smyrna, with its touching account of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp,[3] concluding with a passage which clearly proves the veneration paid, in the earliest times, to the sacred remains of the martyrs.

Speaking of the Donatists, who separated from the Church early in the fourth century, he uses this language: "These sectarians, called Donatists, were, after full examination of their cause by councils of bishops and by the emperor Constantine, universally rejected and condemned. They continued, however, for two or three centuries to disturb and persecute the Church in Africa. *Separations like these, where rival worship was established, were in those ages regarded as most heinous sins, and destructive of salvation.*"[4] This is truly a sweeping admission, extorted by the most overwhelming evidence of history. It seals the death warrant of all those separatists of modern times, who have "established rival worships," including of course the Anglican Church, which fairly comes under this category!

Among his many important omissions during the epoch under consideration, we will briefly allude to the following. He does not tell us that St. Peter went to Rome and died there; a fact to which all antiquity bears evidence,[5] and which he himself is forced afterwards to grant. He even says: "the date of St. Peter's epistle from Babylon suggests the probability of his having preached in Chaldea;"[6] whereas it is a notorious fact, admitted we think by all the learned, that Babylon of Chaldea was not then in existence. Grotius, a learned Protestant, and others, with much more probability, think that by *Babylon* St. Peter meant Pagan Rome, which St. John and the early Christians designated by that name.

He likewise makes no mention whatever of the famous miracle obtained by the prayers of the Christian legion, which served in the army of Marcus Aurelius, in his expedition against the Quadi and Marcomanni. The miracle secured victory to the imperial arms, in a most signal manner, and under the most trying circumstances. It was public and notorious; it is attested by Tertullian and Eusebius, and is established by other incontestable evidence. It was most glorious for the Christian name, and it obtained from the emperor himself for the legion the title of *legio tonans*, or thundering legion.[1]

---

[1] De Morte Persecutorum.
[2] P. 14, *et. seq.*
[3] P. 16, *et. seq.*
[4] P. 27.
[5] Among other works on this subject, see Fogginio — *De itinere Romano et Episcopatu D. Petri* 1 vol. 4to. — where overwhelming evidence on the subject is accumulated.
[6] P. 8.

Another omission, much more important still, is that of the *disciplina arcani*, or discipline of secret, very common in the early Church; and without which, in fact, it is almost impossible to understand the faith and worship of the epoch of which we are speaking. This discipline required caution and concealment in speaking, before pagans and the uninitiated, of the greater mysteries of the Christian faith, such as the Trinity and the Eucharist, in order not "to throw pearls before swine."[2] The unquestionable prevalence of this discipline, is a triumphant evidence of the belief in the real presence during that period.[3] Was this the reason why our historian said nothing about it?

He is himself very fond of this same discipline of secret, in regard to those things which he did not find it expedient to state, because they might be opposed to his theory. Thus he tells us "of the Gnostics and Manicheans,[4] who held that our Lord's body was not real, but a mere phantom, and that he did not die on the cross;"[5] but he forgot to give us this testimony of St. Ignatius, martyr, bearing directly on the subject: "they (the Gnostics) abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they do not acknowledge the Eucharist *to be the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins, and which the Father by his goodness resuscitated.*"[6]

We should be endless, were we to attempt to supply all his important omissions in this way. For once, however, he violates the discipline of secret, and gives us pretty correctly the famous testimony of St. Justin, martyr, on the holy Eucharist. The philosopher martyr had set him the example for this violation, as he had found it necessary, for the defense of Christianity against the base slanders of its enemies, to speak out plainly on the belief of the early Christians upon this subject,—too plainly as we shall see to suit the taste of our Oxford divine. Here are his words as cited by Mr. Palmer: "We do not receive it (the Eucharist) as common bread or common drink; but as, by the word of God, our Savior Jesus Christ was incarnate, and had flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we have been instructed that the food, blessed by the word of prayer which is from him, through which our flesh and blood by a change are nourished, is (spiritually) the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus."[7]

That word *spiritually*, it is almost needless to say, came from Oxford;

---

[1] For a full account and vindication of this miracle, see Palma, *Prælectiones*. vol. i, P. 1, p. 76, *et seq*. c. xiv.

[2] Palma, ibid. p. 82, *et seq*. The best thing on the subject is perhaps the learned dissertation of Schelestrate — *De Disciplina Arcani*.

[3] See "Faith of Catholics," vol. ii, p. 158, seqq., Edition of Dolman, London, 1846; in 3 vols. 8vo. See also the "Amicable Discussion."

[4] We greatly doubt whether the Manicheans taught any such thing.

[5] P. 185.

[6] Epistola ad Smyrnæos, p. 36, tom. ii, PP. Apostolic. Amstelodami, 1724.

[7] The passage is taken from an apology (the first) of St. Justin to the Roman emperor and senate — though it might be taken from any other of St Justin's writings, for all Mr. Palmer tells us.

and like many other things that have lately come from Oxford, it makes arrant nonsense. It makes St. Justin say, that as Christ took flesh *really*, so "the food," &c. becomes his flesh *spiritually!* Why was that word interjected at all, unless it was thought and *felt*, that the sense would be very different without it? Are we to give credit to Mr. Palmer for this interpolation, or is it "a hasty slip of the pen," by his Right Reverend editor and commentator?

The errors of our historian in point of fact, though not so numerous in this as in the subsequent epochs of his history, yet are frequent. He seems to have an instinctive dislike for the bishops of Rome, and wherever they are concerned, you may expect from him little accuracy or fairness. Thus he tells us roundly, that Victor, bishop of Rome, towards the close of the second century, "proceeded to the extent of separating them (the Asiatics) from his communion; an act," he continues, "which was disapproved of by St. Irenæus and the greater part of the Church."[1] It is much more probable, to say the least, that Victor merely threatened excommunication, and was dissuaded from carrying his threat into execution, as he had the power to do, by the arguments of St. Irenæus. It is not true that "the greater part of the Church disapproved of his conduct." He was certainly in the right, and the general council of Nice, in 325, which we apprehend represented "the greater part of the Church," decided that he was right, and excommunicated all who would thereafter persist in the practice adopted by the Asiatics.[2]

His account of the controversy between St. Stephen and St. Cyprian, on re-baptizing those baptized by heretics, is yet more glaringly inaccurate. He tells us, that "Stephen insisted that the custom of the Roman Church should be adopted, and separated the African churches, on their refusal, from his communion. This act, however, was not approved or recognized by the majority of bishops."[3] The contrary is the fact. St. Augustine tells us that Cyprian "continued in the peace of unity with St. Stephen:"[4] and St. Jerome says the same.[5] Their testimony is at least as good as Mr. Palmer's flippant assertions. And as to the majority of bishops having been opposed to Stephen, it is utterly false, and we challenge proof to the contrary. St. Augustine assures us, in many places of his voluminous writings on the subject, that a "plenary council" decided in favor of Stephen, and that the whole Church agreed with him. At the time of the controversy itself, numerous councils were held in various parts of the Church, which approved of the course adopted by the Roman Pontiff.[6]

By the way, it is a singular fact, that, in some way or other, the Roman Pontiffs, from the earliest days of the Church, *always* triumphed because they always happened to be right: and their triumph in the persons of Victor and Stephen is a conclusive proof that the primacy was then recognized. Else why would men so holy have ever thought of excommunicating churches in Africa and Asia? And why did not the Church protest against this usurpation, if it was an usurpation? In both those controversies, it is remarkable that the opponents of the Pontiffs never once thought of questioning their *right* or *power* to excommunicate: they merely deprecated its exercise. If Mr. Palmer is so much pleased with the practice of the Asiatics in keeping Easter, why does not his Church now adopt it, instead of the contrary one of Rome?

---

[1] P. 25. [2] See Palma, *Prælectiones*, vol. i, P. 1, p. 206, *et seq.* for all the documents on this subject.
[3] P. 26. [4] De Baptismo, lib. iv, c. 25—"Eum in unitatis pace cum eo permansisse."
[5] Dialog adversus Luciferianos. [6] Palma, vol i, P. 1, p. 163, *et seq.* and p. 142, *et seq.*

These facts may enable us to judge, what credit is due to the assertion of our historian, that though "some churches had pre-eminent distinction on account of their opulence and magnitude," yet "all bishops and churches, however, were regarded as perfectly equal in the sight of God, (*and of men?*) and regulated their own affairs, and exercised discipline with perfect freedom."[1] The testimony of Irenæus, and the voice of all antiquity, trace the pre-eminence of certain churches to other causes altogether, than those carnal-minded ones assigned by Mr. Palmer. They tells us, that the Roman see was the "chair of Peter;" that the second in pre-eminence, that of Alexandria, was founded by Peter's disciple, Mark; and that the third, Antioch, was Peter's see, before he removed to Rome. A volume might be filled with testimonies to prove that the Roman Pontiffs held the primacy from the beginning of the Church. Archbishop Kenrick's triumphant work on the Primacy is a tissue of such authorities. Would not Bishop Whittingham do well to edit this work also "with notes?" It is an answer to a publication by one of his own brother bishops, and it yet remains, perhaps for a very obvious reason, unanswered.

By the by, we have little fault to find with the bishop's notes under this epoch: but we suppose it is chiefly because he has been very reserved. There is, however, a little note of his on page 23, in which he corrects a *true* statement of Palmer, who had asserted in the text that "Irenæus was crowned with martyrdom." The episcopal annotator here remarks: "so some think, but without sufficient evidence." We know not what new light has been shed on the bishop's mind, or what evidence he would deem sufficient. We find the fact stated in every Church historian within our reach, and we know it is the basis of a very old and general Church office. It has ever been the belief of the Church of Lyons, which keeps the feast of the martyr on the 28th of June. Though it is a matter comparatively unimportant, we are really curious to know what facts can be brought to prove, that Irenæus did not die a martyr under Septimius Severus.

We might remark on many other inaccuracies under this first epoch; but the subjects will recur in the sequel, and we must hasten on. We merely pause to notice, in passing, our author's singular method of accounting for the conversion of the emperor Constantine. He says:

"So great was the progress of religion, notwithstanding the violent and cruel persecutions to which it was continually exposed, that it became no less the interest than the duty of the first Christian emperor, Constantine the Great, to relieve the Church from persecution, to act as the defender of its faith, and to distinguish its ministers and members by marks of his favor and generosity."

---

[1] P. 33.

We had thought, in our simplicity, that Constantine the Great was actuated by much higher and purer motives than interest. We had read in Eusebius, a cotemporary historian of high repute, of a magnificent cross which appeared to him at noon-day in the heavens, bearing the motto: "εν τουτω νικα"—IN THIS CONQUER; and that Constantine had made a banner like it, called the *Labarum*, which beckoned him on to victory.[1] We had read all this; but we suppose that if Eusebius had chanced to be born in Oxford in these latter days, this and all other heavenly visions would have vanished from his disenchanted eyes! Well, we admire the march of mind, and the progress of enlightenment!

EPOCH II, A. D. 320—680.[2]

This was, in a more particular manner, the epoch of struggles with, and triumphs over heresy. During this period the Church saw Arianism, Macedonianism, Nestorianism, Eutychianism, Pelagianism, and Monothelitism, rise in succession, create great disturbances for a time, and then sink again in the bosom of that darkness from which they had emerged. All of these formidable heresies, except Pelagianism, originated among the subtle and disputatious Greeks of the Eastern church. Rome proscribed them all; and then, as ever since, the voice of Rome was re-echoed through the world by the great body of bishops. During this period, as always, the successor of Peter continued to fulfill the divine injunctions: "Feed my lambs; feed my sheep."[3] "And thou (Peter) being once converted, confirm thy brethren."[4] The Lord Jesus had "prayed for Peter that his faith might not fail."[5] And, accordingly, St. Cyprian, in the third century, assures us that "heretical perfidy never could have access to the chair of Peter, the principal Church, *whence the sacerdotal unity took its rise.*"[6] All ancient Church History proclaims this remarkable fact, that the Roman Pontiffs, in all the controversies of those times, were ever in the right in their official capacity.

It is by some considered as doubtful, whether the story of the fall of Pope Liberius be well founded. If he subscribed any formulary of faith different from that of Nice, it is *certain*, that such formulary was not heretical, but merely defective; and that he was induced to yield thus far, while under restraint, and after his spirit had been broken by a two years' rigorous confinement. Whatever he did, he did it in his private capacity alone, and not as the pastor of the universal Church. As soon as he recovered his liberty, it is admitted on all hands, that, he became a most staunch defender of the Church against Arianism.[1] The most ardent advocates of papal prerogative never once dreamed of asserting that the Pope, as a private individual, is either impeccable or infallible.

---

[1] See a critical examination of the whole matter in Palma, vol. i, P. II, p. 82, *et seq.*

[2] From p. 34—74.

[3] St. John, xxi, 15—17.

[4] Luke, xxii, 32.

[5] Luke xxii, 32.

[6] Epist. lv, p. 86.

The only other Pontiff who has been charged with heresy, with any appearance of plausibility, is Honorius I., who, it is alleged, was condemned as a heretic in the sixth œcumenical council, held in 680, the last year of the present epoch. Mr. Palmer[2] evidently chuckles over the supposed fall of this Pontiff. But it is not even pretended, that Honorius actually defined anything against Catholic faith; his whole fault, if it was a fault, consisted in enjoining silence on the disputants at the first commencement of the controversy. His epistles to Sergius, bishop of Constantinople, clearly establish this. The wily Greek had misrepresented the real state of the controversy, and had deceived the unsuspecting Pontiff. The result was unfortunate, as the enemies of the faith, among whom Sergius was the chief, carefully availed themselves of the disciplinary injunction of the Pontiff, to spread their heresy in the East. And this reason, no doubt, prompted the council to condemn Honorius, as a favorer of heretics. This council was composed almost entirely of Greek bishops, whose bosoms were already swayed by a rising jealousy of Rome; which feeling, a little later, led them into open schism:[3] and there is no evidence, that the incidental charge against Honorius was ever approved by the Western Church.

Our historian thus speaks of the origin of the monastic life:—the italics are ours.

> "Many of the most truly pious and holy men whom those ages produced, were among those who lived retired from the world, and who were engaged solely in the service of God. A life entirely devoted to religion, and separated from all domestic cares, pleasures, and occupations, had been the characteristic of the ascetics and virgins *even from the time of the apostles;* but the monastic or solitary life was first exhibited on a broad scale by Anthony and his disciples in Egypt, at the latter end of the third, and the beginning of the fourth century."[4]

"In the present age," he adds, "it is, perhaps, difficult to appreciate justly the religious character of ascetic religion in the early Church."[5] This is, alas! but too true. Protestantism never had any relish for this life of prayer and self-denial; these are not palatable to our modern religionists' dainty taste.

The historian's admission, in regard to the antiquity of the ascetics and sacred virgins, was too much for his Right Reverend editor; who, breathing a more anti-popery atmosphere, is not yet prepared to go as far Romeward, even as Professor Palmer. In a note, he very sagely remarks, that "these (ascetics and virgins) certainly did not exist as distinct classes before the end of the second century; nor even then in anything resembling the form of monkery." The end of the second century is a very respectable antiquity of itself: but would not the avowed fact of their general existence in the second century, argue a more ancient origin? What would the bishop think of the argument, that because we find mention of the order of bishops in writers of the second century, therefore this order had *certainly* no previous existence? Yet his is precisely parallel.

---

[1] For full evidence on this subject, see Palma, vol. i, P. II, p. 94, *et seq.*, and p. 108, *et seq.*

[2] Page 47.

[3] Palma treats the whole subject with his usual learning and ability, vol. ii, P. I, p. 104, *et seq.*

[4] Page 49.

[5] Ibid.

Both Tertullian[1] and St. Cyprian[2] wrote treatises expressly on the duties of sacred virgins; which clearly proves their recognized existence, as a distinct class in the second and third centuries, and also establishes their prior origin. As to the "form of monkery," we will not dispute about forms, so the substance be admitted. In the first century, the Therapeutes of the East were a species of monks; and the order of sacred virgins existed from the days of the apostles. We read in the Acts, that Philip the Evangelist "had four daughters virgins, who did prophesy;"[3] and the seventh chapter of St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians clearly implies the apostolical origin of holy virgins and celibataries. Carnal-minded Protestantism can not understand or appreciate all this. In our modern systems of religion, matrimony seems to constitute the *summum bonum,* and virginity is almost as much despised as it was among the heathens of old! Who will venture to deny this?

Among the many important omissions of our author under this epoch, we have time to mention only one. He says nothing of the attempt made by Julian, the apostate, to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, with the avowed purpose of falsifying the predictions of Christ; nor of the miraculous manner in which that attempt was frustrated by God. Yet this is perhaps one of the most triumphant proofs of the divinity of the Christian Religion, and it should not therefore have been omitted, even in a compendious history. The fact is testified to by all Christian antiquity; and it is vouched for even by the cotemporary pagan historian, Ammianus Marcellinus, a great admirer of Julian.[4]

The errors and misstatements of our author and of his editor are here so numerous, that we scarcely have space to advert even transiently to the principal of them. On pages 43, 44, we have no less than three notes, in which Bishop Whittingham corrects *true* statements made in the text. Mr. Palmer calls Nestorius "a vain and arrogant man," and gives a correct account of his heresy. The episcopal commentator here remarks: "Nestorius hardly has justice done him by this statement . . . the most accurate investigations leave little room for doubt, that he did not teach the heretical doctrine afterwards put forth by some who took part in the dispute, and bore his name." Ah indeed! So the Protestant bishop of Maryland has, "by his more accurate investigations," ascertained more than had been found out by the two hundred bishops who composed the council of Ephesus, and by nearly all the historians of antiquity! We give him credit for his wonderful discovery: but until he gives us some *facts* on the subject, we must be pardoned for believing that Nestorius was a heretic.[1]

---

[1] De Velandis Virginibus.

[2] De Virginibus

[3] Acts, xxi, 9.

[4] Apud Palma, vol 1, P. II, p. 23, *et seq.*

The second *correction* to which we just alluded, is the substitution in the note of the word *testimony*, for that of the *decision* of the council of Ephesus against Nestorius. The bishop is evidently alarmed at the spectre of church authority *deciding* on controversy. Feeling that his own church is powerless, *even to silence a recreant parson*, he would fain snatch from the ancient Church also her spiritual armor of authoritative teaching.

The third *correction* contains a libel on St. Cyril of Alexandria, who, in the text, had been praised as having had "the honor of being the principal opponent of this heresy" (the Nestorian). The editor adds: "but not without sullying himself with the use of very unbefitting means." Here also he flatly contradicts all Christian antiquity.

Again, the historian speaks of St. Patrick and St. Palladius, the respective apostles of Ireland and Scotland, though singularly enough he makes them both the apostles of Ireland; and we are sure the Irish will thank him for the discovery!

> "The apostolical labors of St. Patrick were rewarded by the conversion of the Irish nation to Christianity. Palladius had been previously ordained to the same mission by Cœlestinus, bishop of Rome," &c.[2]

Not at all, says the episcopal editor:

> "This is extremely doubtful, or rather almost certainly untrue. That both Palladius and Patrick preached in Ireland, early in the fifth century, is certain."

If Palladius visited Ireland, he remained but a short time.[3] But the bishop further observes:

> "That neither of them had any direct communication with Rome is in the highest degree probable."

And yet St. Prosper, a cotemporary historian, testifies in his chronicle, that Palladius was ordained by Pope Cœlestine for the Scotch.[4] Which are we to believe? All the ancient authors of St. Patrick's life agree in stating, that after his second captivity, he traveled through France and

---

[1] Another instance of the sympathy of errorists for one another, is furnished by the great parade lately made over a Nestorian bishop, whom the Rev. Justus Perkins brought to this country as a kind of show!

[2] P. 45.

[3] We are aware that the words *Scoti* and *Hiberni* were interchangeable terms for several centuries: yet St. Patrick, in his confessions, clearly distinguishes between them, and so do other ancient documents. The learned Alban Butler thinks that the Scots first settled in Ireland, and then removed to Scotland. See Butler's lives of Saints, 17th March, *note*. Dublin edition.

[4] "Ad Scotos in Christum credentes ordinatur a Papa Cœlestino Palladius, et primus episcopus mittitur." — *Chronicon. ad annum* 431. The Chronicle begins with Adam, and comes down to the year 455, and it is very good authority, especially against a mere assertion.

Italy, visited Rome, and received his mission, together with the apostolical benediction, from Pope Cœlestine, who died A. D. 432.[1]

Speaking of the ancient British and Irish churches, Mr. Palmer makes this reckless assertion :

> "The ancient churches of the Britons which still continued, as well as the Irish churches, were not subject to the jurisdiction of the bishops of Rome, nor was the Anglo-Saxon Church for many centuries, though much reverence was felt for the ancient and celebrated Church of Rome, and much assistance derived from it in the earlier stages of their existence."[2]

And again :

> "The ancient British and Irish churches, in the sixth and seventh centuries, were treated as schismatics by the Roman church in consequence of their adherence to their ancient customs, and for not submitting to the authority of the papal see ; but they were acknowledged as Christians by many churches."[3]

And to make bad worse, the bishop of Maryland adds this note about the "ancient customs :"

> "For which they *truly* pleaded apostolical warrant, in the practice of St. John, derived to them through the churches of Gaul."

It would require too much space to refute all the misstatements contained in these remarkable passages, which are selected almost at random, from many more of a similar kind. We will barely enumerate them, and say a word or two on each.

1. The ancient British and Irish churches *were* subject to the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiffs, as a host of facts clearly show ; and we challenge proof to the contrary. In both, Christianity and its first teachers had come from Rome. At the close of the second century, Pope Eleutherius (about 180) had sent to England Fugatius and Damianus, at the instance of King Lucius. This is attested by all the older British writers.[4] Whether, previously to this time, the gospel was preached, at least to any extent, in England or not, is doubtful ; but if it was, it had made but few disciples.[5] But for Rome, England would perhaps never have been converted. Besides, the primacy apart, England was in the western patriarchate, and under this title, like the other western churches, was subject to the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiffs, who were also avowedly patriarchs of the west.

2. That the Irish churches were ever treated as schismatical by Rome, is an assertion unsustained by proof. The Irish church was never for a moment stained with either heresy or schism.

---

[1] So says Probus, who wrote a life of the saint, according to Bollandus, some time in the seventh century. The Cistercian monk, Jocelin, who also wrote his life in the twelfth century, and who refers to four different lives of the saint written before his time, relates the same fact. See Butler's Lives of Saints, 17th March, Dublin edition. Surely all this testimony should outweigh the bare assertion of Bishop Whittingham.

[2] P. 46.

[3] P 67.

[4] For facts see Lingard — "Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon church," p. 18, American edition.

[5] Idem, p. 17, *note*.

3. The British churches never refused to admit the authority of the papal see. The controversy did not turn on this point. They merely refused to submit to St. Augustine, because he could not sanction their customs, and would not brook their notorious immorality, attested by all cotemporary writers. The testimony of Gildas, an historian of the time, clearly proves that they acknowledged the authority of the Roman Pontiffs, even after that authority had proscribed them: for their clergy still went to Rome to obtain ecclesiastical preferment.[1]

4. The British churches did not "*truly* plead apostolical warrant for their customs," as Bishop Whittingham says; nor did they plead it at all. They merely alleged the example of St. Columban and of their forefathers. St. John and the churches of Gaul had nothing to do with the controversy. It is ascertained that the British churches were not *quartodecimans*, or did not persist in keeping Easter with the Jews. They merely refused to adopt the improvement in the calendar introduced by Dionysius Exiguus, and already adopted by Rome and the whole Church. The venerable Bede tells us, that their remoteness from the rest of the world was the reason of their ignorant adherence to an erroneous calendar.[2] By the way, as Bishop Whittingham so greatly admires those "ancient customs," why does he not adopt them, and shave his own head in the form of a crescent? In this strange plight, and keeping Easter about a month sooner or later than his brethren, he would certainly excite admiration! He would be a glorious reformer, "*truly* pleading apostolical warrant!"

5. We would much like to see any evidence going to prove, that after their separation from Rome, "the British churches were acknowledged as Christians by many churches." We doubt whether there is *one* fact in history to warrant this assertion.

6. That the Anglo-Saxon church acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiffs, from the time of St. Augustine to the reformation, could be proved by a whole volume of evidence. But our space will not allow us even to touch on this subject.[3]

Professor Palmer gives us some very fine sketches of St. Anthony, of St. Pachomius, of St. Martin, and of many other principal saints and illustrious ornaments of this period.[4] They are judicious, well selected, and edifying; written too in the right spirit. He even speaks with great praise of that remarkable man, St. Simeon Stylites,[5] who passed many years of his life on the top of a column, in order to escape the importunity of the multitudes who flocked to him for his blessing. He tells us how this holy man was venerated by emperors, empresses, and bishops; and how he converted thousand of pagans to the Christian faith. He gives this opinion of his character:

[1] This whole subject is ably handled by Lingard. Ibid. p. 41, *et seq.*

[2] "Utpote qui longe extra orbem positis nemo synodalia Paschalis observantiæ decreta porrexerat." — lib. iii, c. 4.

[3] For facts and authorities on this interesting subject, we refer the reader to Dr. Kenrick on the Primacy Part I, ch. xvi; also to the late eloquent work of Dr. Ives — "Trials of a mind," &c.

[4] P. 44, *et. seq.*

[5] P. 55, 56.

> "An example of want of moderation in self-denial and mortification is frequently pointed out in the case of St. Simeon Stylites, who lived in the fifth century. Yet it is impossible not to admit that, with some excesses in these respects, there was much to admire and venerate in his character."[1]

This eulogy did not suit the taste of the Episcopal editor. He says, in a note:

> "The excesses of Simeon were more reprehensible than mere 'want of moderation in self-denial and mortification.' His multiplied bowings, protracted watchings, constrained postures, and pillar-isolation, belong to a low class of superstition, and furnish a melancholy proof of the degenerating tendencies of the age."

The Protestant bishop is far too enlightened to relish these same "multiplied bowings and protracted watchings;" as to the "constrained postures," his very soul abhors them. Only think of the "degenerating tendencies of the age!" Rank popery perched on a pillar, surrounded by admiring thousands, in the middle of the fifth century! It is really too bad! It is absolutely shocking to the nerves of a delicate Protestant bishop, even to think of those austerities! To be more serious: the example of St. Simeon is extraordinary, and almost single in Church History. It belongs to the class of things admirable, but not imitable. In those warm Eastern climates, it was not unusual, at that day, for persons to pass considerable portions of their lives in the open air, or on the terraces of their houses. The manner of life of St. Simeon was, then, after all, not so very great a departure from the usage of his time and country, as might appear at first sight. We make these remarks merely to steady the bishop's nerves.

Dr. Palmer devotes an entire chapter[2] to what he styles "the rise of abuses and corruptions." This chapter is a tissue of unfounded assertion and of special pleading, from beginning to end. It is bad enough already; and hence the bishop makes no notes. It would far transcend our limits to enter into a detailed refutation of its glaring perversion of facts and evidence. On one page alone, we have marked no less than four false statements, for the refutation of each of which, however, a separate paper would be necessary. We will offer only a few general remarks.

The gist of the reasoning consists in the assertion, that many doctrines,—invocation of saints, veneration for relics, purgatory, and others,—led to great abuses; and in the inference thence drawn, that they were, therefore, rightly repudiated by Protestants. The things were good in their origin and harmless in themselves; they were subsequently abused; therefore, they were justly abolished. Under this leveling reasoning, everything in Christianity, and the bible itself would be swept away. He says:

"Could the pious fathers of the fourth century, who in their orations apostrophized the departed saints and martyrs, and called for their prayers to God, have foreseen the abuses to which this practice was to lead, . . . they would carefully have avoided the introduction of a practice so dangerous to true religion."

---

[1] P. 55.

[2] Chap. x, p. 68, *et seq.*

Could they now rise from their graves, how they would rebuke those, who, under pretence of promoting true religion, have mutilated or rejected the practices which they so much cherished! How they would be charmed too with the motley appearance of modern Protestantism! According to our Oxford divine, even the Church, sustained, as he delights to repeat it was, by the promises of Christ, was yet wanting in knowledge on this subject:

> "The Church has not always been gifted with a spirit of wisdom and foreknowledge, to discern the future abuses of opinions and practices, which it originally permitted without reproof."[1]

For our parts, we greatly prefer the wisdom of the Church, which Christ promised to protect from error, and which he commanded us to hear, to the new-fangled and mystical notions of Oxford. It may be childish simplicity in us; but if we err in hearing the Church, we err by the express command of Christ!

Professor Palmer will not admit, that either the seventh or the eighth council was œcumenical, or general. The former condemned the Iconoclasts, and maintained the lawfulness of images in churches; the latter condemned the intruder Photius, that ambitious man who had been consecrated bishop of Constantinople in six days from being a mere layman, while St. Ignatius, the lawful bishop, was still living. He tells us, that the former was rejected by the Western, and the latter by the Eastern church.[2] Neither of these assertions is true, as we could easily accumulate evidence to prove, did our limits permit. The Roman Pontiffs certainly sanctioned the canons of the seventh council, or the second of Nice, held in 787. And with them the bulk of the Western bishops certainly agreed, at least after a brief hesitancy. The fathers of the council at Frankfort, in 794, merely labored under an error of fact, founded on a false version of the Nicene canons: this error was subsequently removed, and the Western bishops then gave in their adhesion.

What the bishops of the Greek church may have thought on the subject after their final rupture with Rome under Michael Cerularius, is not important: but during the two centuries intervening between the holding of the eighth general council and this final schism, they had certainly, at least a majority of them, received its decisions.[3] There is, in a word, as much evidence to prove that these councils are œcumenical, as there is to prove the same of the six preceding ones, which our author receives. Objections had been made to all of them for a time; but they were all finally sanctioned by the body of bishops.

---

[1] Pages 68, 69.

[2] Page 47.

[3] See Palma, vol. ii, part ii, p. 15, *et seq.*, and p. 26, *et seq*, and ibid, p. 89, *et seq.*, and p. 114, *et seq.*, for full proofs on the subject of the seventh and eighth general councils.

We have now finished our remarks on this epoch; and with them we also close this paper. We have not noticed one-half the passages we had marked for animadversion; but the few specimens we have been able to give will serve to show the general character for accuracy of Mr. Palmer's work, as also that of its Right Reverend editor. Our readers will probably concur with us in opinion, that Bishop Whittingham might have been much better employed, than in writing notes on Palmer's Church History. He might, for instance, have devoted his leisure moments to an answer to Archbishop Kenrick's book on the Primacy.

II. CHURCH HISTORY.*

ARTICLE II.—THE MIDDLE AGES.

A different Division suggested — Triumphs of the Church over Barbarism — Missionaries sent by Rome — The Ages of Faith — Auricular Confession — Testimonies of Tertullian and St. Cyprian — Nectarius and the Penitentiary — Puseyite View of the Holy Eucharist — Paschasius Radbert and Berengarius — Temporal Authority of the Pope and Bishops — Decretals of Isidore — Prerogatives of the Roman Pontiffs — Pope Julius I. — Greek Schism — Order of Pre-eminence — Michael Cerularius — Shaving the Beard — The Nicene Canons — Edifying Incident of St. Anselm — Modern Anglican Parsons — Vision of "Roman attempts at Usurpation" — Have the Promises of Christ failed? — The Roman Primacy acknowledged by the early Greek Church — And at Councils of Lyons and Florence — When was the Doctrine of the Primacy Defined? — Purgatory — Transubstantiation — Indulgences — Protestant *Indulgences* — Penitential Works — Repudiating the Debt — The Rosary — "The Pure and Holy One" — Temporal power of the Popes — Its influence on Civilization.

In our first paper, we extended our review of Mr. Palmer's work to the beginning of the third epoch of Church History, according to his division. In the present, we intend to offer some remarks upon the third and fourth epochs, which bring the history down to the reformation. To the period which has elapsed since this eventful revolution, we will have to devote a separate paper, which will be the last of this series.

We have already intimated that we did not approve of the idea of our author, which makes the year 680,—the date of the seventh general council, against the Monothelites,—a distinct era in Church History, on the ground that this was the *last* general council. We have briefly shown how unfounded is this assumption. We would have greatly preferred a less whimsical, and more rational division, and one, at the same time, more conformable to the great vicissitudes of ecclesiastical history. We would have divided the period which elapsed from the accession of Constantine the Great, as sole emperor, in the year 324, to the reformation in 1517, into four, instead of three epochs.

The first would have terminated with the fall of the Roman empire in the west, in the year 476,—an event of sufficient importance, surely, both in general and ecclesiastical history, to form a distinct epoch. This period, embracing one hundred and fifty-two years, witnessed the rise, progress, and condemnation of the four great heresies against the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation; as well as the holding of the first four general councils, which St. Gregory I. and the ancient fathers revered as they did the four gospels. The second epoch would have closed with the crowning of Charlemagne, in the beginning of the ninth century, and it would have traced the first great struggle of the Church with barbarism, and her first successful efforts for the conversion of the northern nations. The third epoch would have closed with the consummation of the Greek schism under Michael Cerularius, in 1054; and it would have unfolded the triumphant termination of the struggles and efforts just alluded to. Finally, the fourth epoch would have terminated with the reformation; and it would have coincided with that of our author. This division seems to us more in conformity with the great phases of Church History. We will, however, continue our remarks on the division into epochs adopted by our Oxford historian.

---

* *A Compendious Ecclesiastical History, from the earliest period to the present time.* By the Rev. William Palmer, M. A., of Worcester College, Oxford. With a Preface and Notes, by an American Editor. New York, 1841, republished. 1 vol. 12mo. pp. 228.

EPOCH III, A. D 680 — 1054.[1]

This was, in a special manner, the period of the triumph of the Church over barbarism, in the conversion of the northern nations. Mr. Palmer gives us[2] a very brief and imperfect summary of facts on this subject; but he almost forgets to inform us, that the credit of those glorious triumphs is mainly due to the Roman Pontiffs. He merely tells us incidentally, that "at length Boniface went to Rome, by desire of Pope Gregory II., who ordained him bishop for the mission among the heathens east of the Rhine."[3] He might have told us the same of all the great apostles of the north, who were either sent directly by Rome, or who at least undertook their apostolical labors with the approval of the Roman Pontiffs. Even M. D'Aubigné, the unscrupulous Protestant historian of the reformation, admits as much. He informs us, that "the Germans had received from Rome that element of modern civilization, the faith. Instruction, legislation; ALL, save their courage and their weapons, had come to them from the sacerdotal city. Strong ties had, from that time, attached Germany to the papacy."[4]

We shall soon have occasion to see, in what language our author speaks of the abuses and corruptions of this period, in doing which he but re-echoes the stereotyped charges of prejudiced and partisan historians. As an offset to these accusations, and at the same time as a specimen of the admirable consistency of Puseyism, we will first give some of his admissions on the faith and piety of those much abused ages. In regard to the faith then prevalent he speaks thus:

> "The same great truths of religion were universally adopted; the same Scriptures were diligently studied by all who had the means of doing so, — for in those days, before the invention of printing, when all books were transcribed by manual labor, they were both scarce and

---

[1] From p. 76 — 106. [2] P. 75, *et. seq.* [3] P. 89.

[4] "History of the Great Reformation," &c., in three volumes, 12mo. vol. 1, pp. 78, 79. Edit. Carter, New York, 1848.

expensive; and an universal appeal was made to the sentiments of the ancient fathers and councils in the interpretation of the Bible."[1]

In the very chapter in which he treats of the "abuses and superstitions" of the period under consideration, he has the following admission in regard to the state of religion at that time:

> "And if, as we have reason to believe, a large portion of the community were (*was?*) accustomed to receive the holy eucharist three times a year, we may trust that the state of religion was in those ages not so bad as it has been sometimes represented; and the present age, with all its advantages of civilization, peace, and education, would perhaps scarcely be able to prove its greater attention to known duties, or its more conscientious obedience to the impulse of conscience."[2]

From the following extract it would clearly appear, that, even in his opinion, those ages of faith were far ahead of the present enlightened times in piety and devotion:—

> "Nor has there ever been a period in the history of the Church, when the spirit of religion, where it existed, was more ardent and earnest. The religion of those times was less learned, less accomplished (!) less free from superstition (!), than that of earlier ages; but it can scarcely be said to have been less zealous, less productive of good works. Its characteristics were the deepest humility, renouncement of self, denial of the passions and even of the enjoyments and pleasures of the world; boundless charity to the poor; the foundation of churches, schools, and religious houses; diligent study of the Scriptures, singing of psalms, and much prayer. We see not merely one or two, but hundreds of men forsaking all their earthly prospects, the resorts of their youth, and the paths of ambition, to devote themselves to the conversion of the heathen. We see them desiring and rejoicing to die for Christ; and, by their patience, piety, and wisdom, bringing multitudes of heathens into the way of salvation. We see many of the most powerful monarchs engaged in all the exercises of continual devotion and charity, or descending from the summit of earthly grandeur to spend the remainder of their days in penitence and prayer. However sad may have been the calamities of the Church, and however great the faults of Christians, yet when we see such things as these, we cannot refrain from the conviction that the Spirit of God was still influencing the hearts of many people; nor fail to perceive that the Lord was still, according to his promise, always with his Church."[3]

The tree which produced such fruits as these must have been good, according to the rule of our Lord: "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Our historian confirms the truth of this admirable picture, by appropriate and well written sketches of the lives of many illustrious men who flourished during the period in question: of the Venerable Bede, of Charlemagne, of St. Boniface, of the martyrs of Amorium at Bagdat, of Alfred the Great, and of the anchorite, St. Nilus.[4] These examples are so well exhibited, that we are restrained only by our narrow limits from making our readers sharers in the unmingled pleasure we had in perusing them.

All that surprises us, is, that the Protestant bishop of Maryland did not endeavor to mar the beauty of these sketches by the introduction of a few of his *little* notes! Perhaps the good bishop deemed this a work of supererogation, since Mr. Palmer, here as elsewhere, takes special pains to spoil his own work. He seizes the brush, and recklessly bedaubs his own picture, until scarcely a lineament of its former beauty remains.

---

[1] Page 78. [2] Page 101. [3] Page 85. [4] Pp 85—100.

Confession was one of the cherished practices of medieval piety. It was this great act of self denial which prepared the sainted men and women of that period for the heroic sacrifices which excite the admiration of our historian; — sacrifices to which, by the way, cold and lifeless Protestantism can offer no parallel. Let us see how our Oxfordite discourses on this subject:

> "During these ages, the practice of private confession to a priest was not held generally to be a matter of necessity. We have already seen this custom abolished (as a pre-requisite to the reception of the Eucharist) in the east, by Nectarius, patriarch of Constantinople, in the fourth century, and by the majority of the eastern church. It was still practiced in many parts of the west, but was not regarded as an essential of religion. Bede and Alcuin recommended Christians to confess to the ministers of God all the grievous sins which they could remember. But others, as we learn from Alcuin and Haymo, would not confess their sins to the priest," &c.[1]

We would ask, do Protestant preachers now-a-days, with Bede and Alcuin, "recommend Christians to confess to the ministers of God *all* the grievous sins which they can remember?" Or rather, do they not inveigh, in season and out of season, against this whole practice of confession, as popish and encouraging sin? Do not the parsons of the church of England also join in the general outcry, although their own Prayer Book, in the order for the visitation of the sick, strongly recommends the practice?[2] Do they not rather belong to that class of negligent Christians, whom Alcuin and Haymo reproached, because "they *would not* confess their sins to the priest?" Catholic priests, at the present day, often feel it to be their duty to make a similar reproach to negligent Catholics, which fact, instead of disproving the general belief in the obligation of confession among them, on the contrary, clearly establishes its recognized existence.

The whole statement just given, is, in fact, untrue and unfair from beginning to end.

1. It is not true, that "during these ages, the practice of private confession to a priest was not held generally to be a matter of necessity." It would be very easy to accumulate proof to establish the fact, that, from the very beginning of the Church, the obligation of confession to a priest was generally recognized among Christians. The most ancient fathers, both Greek and Latin, bear unequivocal testimony, not only to the fact that confession was generally practiced in the ages in which they

---

[1] P. 81.

[2] This part of the Prayer Book has been *expunged* from the American editions. It was too *popish* to suit this latitude!

severally wrote, but also as to the other more important one, that its obligation was generally believed and felt. These two facts are indeed intimately connected with each other; for it would have been utterly impossible to induce men generally to adopt so painful an observance, unless they had been previously convinced of its obligation and necessity.

Out of a host of evidence bearing on the subject, our space will allow us to refer only to the testimony of Tertullian and of St. Cyprian, who wrote in the second and third centuries. Both of these fathers agree with all the others who have written on the subject, in enforcing the obligation of *exomologesis*, or confession to a priest. Tertullian says of confession:

> "Wherefore confession, (*exomologesis*[1]) is a discipline for the abasement and humiliation of man, enjoining such conversation as invites mercy: it directs, also, even in the manner of dress and food — to lie in sackcloth and ashes, to hide the body in mean garments, to cast down the spirit with mourning, to exchange for severe treatment the sins which he has committed; *to fall down before the priests and to kneel before the beloved of God.*[2] All these things does *exomologesis* (confession) perform, that it may commend repentance; that by fearing danger it may honor God; that by itself pronouncing judgment on the sinner, it may act in the stead of God's wrath; and that, by means of temporal affliction, it may, I will not say frustrate, but clear off the eternal penalties."

Speaking of those who defer confession through shame, he says:

> They "are more mindful of their shame than of their salvation, like those who, having contracted some shameful malady, avoid making their physicians acquainted with it, and so perish with their bashfulness. It is, forsooth, intolerable to modesty, to make satisfaction to their offended Lord! To be restored to the health which they have wasted away! Brave art thou, in thy modesty, truly, bearing an open front in sinning, and a bashful one in praying for pardon! . . . Verily, the concealment of a sin, promises a great benefit to our modesty! Namely, that if we withdraw any thing from the knowledge of men, we shall also, of course, conceal it from God! And is it thus, then, that the thoughts of men and the knowledge of God are compared? *Is it better to be damned in secret, than to be absolved openly?*"[3]

To extinguish this false shame and encourage the sinner to make his confession, he alleges the following strong motive; — which clearly proves the belief universally prevalent in the second century, that confession of grievous sin was necessary, and of Divine obligation:

> "If thou drawest back from confession (*exomologesis*), consider in thy heart *that* hell-fire which confession shall quench for thee;[4] and first imagine to thyself the greatness of this punishment, that thou mayest not doubt concerning the adoption of the remedy. . . When, therefore, thou knowest that against hell-fire, after that first protection of the baptism ordained by the Lord, there is yet in confession (*exomologesis*) a second

---

[1] The Greek word for confession, often used by the early fathers.

[2] Presbyteris advolvi, et caris Dei adgeniculari. For *caris* — *beloved*, some editions read *aris* — *altars*.

[3] An melius est damnatum latere quam palam absolvi?

[4] Quam tibi exomologesis extinguet.

aid, why dost thou abandon thy salvation? Why delay to enter on that, which thou knowest will heal thee?"[1]

St. Cyprian writes not less clearly of the faith and practice of Christians on this subject, in the third century:

"None can escape the eye of God. He sees the heart and breast of every person; and He will judge, not only our actions, but also our words and thoughts. He regards the minds of all, and the wishes concealed even in the hidden recesses of the breast. In fine, how much loftier in faith, and superior in the fear (of God) are those who, though implicated in no crime of sacrifice, or of accepting a certificate, yet, *because they have only had the thought thereof, this very thing sorrowingly and honestly confessing before the priests of God, make a confession (exomologesis) of their conscience*, expose the burden of the soul, seek out a *salutary cure even* for light and little wounds, knowing that it is written, "God will not be mocked. . . . I beseech you, most dear brethren, let each confess his sin, whilst he that has sinned is yet among the living; while his confession can be admitted; while the satisfaction and the remission, made through the priests, are pleasing before the Lord."[2]

Many similar passages from the writings of these two and of other fathers might be alleged; but these will suffice to show that, even from the very earliest period, the obligation of confession to a priest was generally recognized. And it is not to be supposed, that this obligation was less sensibly or extensively felt during ages which, Mr. Palmer himself assures us, constantly "appealed to the sentiments of the ancient fathers and councils in the interpretation of the Bible."[3]

2. Nor is it at all true that "this custom was abolished in the east by Nectarius, patriarch of Constantinople, in the fourth century, and by the majority of the eastern church."[4] This is a most glaring perversion of history. Nectarius never even dreamed of abolishing *private* confession to a priest; nor did the majority of the eastern church ever think of any such thing. Such confession continued to be general throughout the Greek church after the death of Nectarius, as we learn from his successor, St. Chrysostom, (A. D. 397), and from all the historians of that period. This is altogether certain from incontestable evidence, which we could easily accumulate; and Mr. Palmer should be ashamed to assert the contrary.[5] Both the historians, Sozomenus and Socrates,[6] who relate the fact of Nectarius, plainly bear us out in our assertion.

The former introduces his account of the affair in the following words: "As to avoid all sin is more than human nature can do; and God has commanded pardon to be granted to those that repent, though they have often sinned; and as, in begging pardon, *it is necessary that sin should be at the same time confessed, it, from the beginning*, deservedly seemed to the priests a heavy burden, that sinners should proclaim their sins, as in a theatre, in the presence of all the multitude."[1] He then goes on to state how, some time in the third century, a public penitentiary was appointed to receive the confession, and to enjoin suitable public penance; and how, from a great scandal which occurred in the church of Constantinople, Nectarius was induced, by the popular clamor and indignation, to suppress this office of penitentiary. This functionary presided over the distribution of *public* penances, and was a kind of *censor morum* His office once suppressed, things returned to their usual course, and Christians still believed, as the historian who wrote after the event, assures us, that "it was *necessary* that sin should be confessed." By the act of Nectarius, the office of *public* penitentiary alone was abolished, and with it the discipline of *public* confession, "as in a theatre," was done away with; but the obligation of private confession was still generally felt and acted on. You might as well argue from the breaking of an unworthy magistrate or judge, that the whole administration of justice was abolished, as to argue the general suppression of confession from this fact of Nectarius.

---

[1] De Pœnitentia, n. 8 — 12.

[2] Confiteantur singuli delictum suum, dum adhuc qui deliquit in sæculo est dum admitti confessio ejus potest, dum satisfactio et remissio facta per sacerdotes apud Dominum grata est. — *De Lapsis.*

[3] P. 78, *sup. citat.*

[4] Mr. Palmer had asserted the same thing more in detail on pages 32, 33.

[5] See "Faith of Catholics," vol. III, p. 28, *et. seq*, and Catholic theologians, *passim.*

[6] They wrote in the fifth century, and continued the Church History of Eusebius.

Socrates relates the whole occurrence in almost the same manner; and he unites with Sozomenus in expressing his decided disapproval of the conduct of Nectarius[2]. What both historians add, that after this suppression of the penitentiary, Christians in the east "were permitted to confess their sins to a priest, before communion, as their own judgment might direct them," besides that it had, as they both explicitly avow, no relation whatever to the western churches, could only be meant to imply that *public* confession to the penitentiary was no longer enjoined in the east.[3]

Mr. Palmer is heartily welcome to all the benefit, he or his admirers may be able to derive from these stubborn facts. His version of the matter is the same old stale and hackneyed charge, which had been already repeated and refuted a hundred times; and which, in spite of all evidence to the contrary, will perhaps still be repeated to the end of time by prejudiced smatterers, who may write what they will call *history*.

It is really curious to see how our author applies his strange Oxford theory in regard to the holy Eucharist, to the facts of Church History, during the period in question. If any one can clearly understand his real opinion on the subject, he must have clearer optics than ourselves, even with the aid of our Roman glasses; and Bishop Whittingham, as we shall see, only makes confusion worse confounded. Neither of them seems either to admit or to deny the real presence; they both halt *somewhere* between these two things; but whether they hold to the absurd system of Lutheran consubstantiation, or to the wholly unintelligible opinion of Calvin of a *real figurative* presence; or whether they have struck out a new path or new paths for themselves, we are really not prepared to say. As our readers may, however, be more acute than we are, we will give them an opportunity of judging for themselves; merely recording our decided conviction, that there is, and can be, no rational medium between the full admission of the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, and the unqualified rejection of the real presence altogether.

---

[1] Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. vii. cap. xvi.

[2] Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ, lib. v. cap. xix For all the facts and evidence on the subject see Palma, *Prælectiones*, vol. i, part ii, p. 141, *et. seq.*

[3] See the notes of the learned Henry Valois on the ecclesiastical histories of Socrates and Sezomenus

Mr. Palmer thus writes on the subject:

> "In the ninth century, the doctrine of the holy Eucharist became the subject of discussion. It had never been denied by the Catholic Church, that this sacrament, when consecrated, continues to be bread and wine, according to the words of the apostle: 'the *bread* which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?' and of our Lord, 'I will drink no more of the *fruit of the vine*,'" *etc.*[1]

We humbly enter our solemn protest against the putting of this absurd interpretation, or rather perversion of the Scriptures, into the mouth of the Holy Catholic Church. The passage from St. Paul, and what the apostle farther says on the subject in the following chapter, clearly establish the Catholic doctrine of the real presence; and his calling the holy Eucharist *bread* after the consecration, only proves that it continued to have all the appearances and sensible qualities of bread; while the words of our blessed Lord, as clearly appears from St. Luke's gospel, do not refer to the consecrated wine at all, but merely to that used in the paschal supper, which preceded the institution of the holy Eucharist. All this has been proved over and again; nor does our present scope require or allow us to enter fully into a subject, which has been already fully elucidated.

The historian next proceeds to state, that Paschasius Radbert, a French monk, first introduced the doctrine of transubstantiation (!), and to censure Scotus and Berengarius for falling into the opposite extreme, of "declaring the Eucharist to be a *bare* sign of the body and blood of Christ, contrary to the universal belief of the Church."[2] Here the Right Reverend note-maker feels aggrieved, and undertakes to defend Berengarius after this wise:

> "This was long held to be the case; yet not without doubt. (See *Mosheim.*) But it has lately been disproved by the publication of a treatise of Berenger, fuller and later than any before known, which plainly shows his view of the sacrament to have been different from that of Scotus."

The bishop here again proves himself much wiser than all antiquity, —wiser than the bishops of the eight different councils which successively condemned the errors of Berengarius from the year 1050 to the year 1080,—wiser than Berengarius himself, who repeatedly quotes and praises the opinions of Scotus. We are left to our conjectures as to the character of this "publication of Berenger, fuller and later than any before known;" but we presume that it is not "fuller or later" than the unequivocal recantation of his errors, and profession of the Catholic faith made by him in the council of Bordeaux, in 1080; which confession of faith was satisfactory to the assembled fathers, and obtained his readmission into the bosom of the Catholic Church, from which he is not recorded to have again departed. This is surely the fullest and latest edition of the opinions of Berengarius.

---

[1] Page 80.

[2] Ibid, page 81.

But the bishop evidently wished to catch, in the meshes of Puseyism, the cunning arch-heretic of the eleventh century. If the facts of history would warrant it, we would cheerfully give him, not only Berengarius, but all the heretics of the olden time. In fact, the crafty and versatile archdeacon of Angers (Berengarius) would, we humbly think, have made an excellent Puseyite, had he only chanced to be born at Oxford in the nineteenth century! He had all the qualities requisite for a genuine Oxfordite. He had the knack of so wrapping up his real opinions in obscure verbiage, as to mystify and deceive his cotemporaries, including even many bishops. But Pope Gregory VII. was as cunning at least as he: he caught him at last, won him by kindness, convinced him of his errors, and caused him to recant, first in the Roman council held in 1073, and then, more fully and explicitly, in that of Bordeaux, in 1080. If the Puseyites, who have imitated him in his wanderings, would likewise imitate him in his return to Catholic unity, they would find Pius IX. as kind and paternal as was Gregory VII. But whether the Protestant bishop of Maryland be disposed to follow this "latest" example of Berengarius or not, we at least wish him more success in his effort to make Berengarius a Puseyite, than he has had in a late similar attempt on one Ratramn.[1]

On another page, the bishop gives, in a note, a very curious explanation of the manner in which, what he calls the "unholy tyranny" of Rome originated. As a specimen of sagacious reasoning, it is, in truth, a perfect curiosity in its way. Mr. Palmer had said that during this period "the bishops began to assume temporal authority—"[2] he would have said, more truly, that emperors and princes and circumstances *forced* it upon them. Now here is the editor's sapient note on the subject:

> "It was clearly through these usurpations of the bishops that the unholy tyranny of Rome grew into being. The episcopal claims were gradually concentred in the one apostolical see of the west; and all the power that the weakness or wickedness of temporal princes had thrown into the hands of the spiritual rulers, was thus drawn to a single focus."

Well, we humbly think, and we say it with all due respect, that the bishop's wits were not "drawn to a focus," when he penned this strange note. To us it sounds like something very nearly akin to downright absurdity. The bishops throughout the world acquired more power, and therefore more independence; and hence the Roman Pontiffs were enabled the more easily to establish their "unholy tyranny" over them! We would as soon undertake to extract logic and sense from the vagaries of Puseyism itself, as to gather either from this precious piece of argument!

---

[1] For a learned and satisfactory account of Berengarius, see Palma, *Prælectiones*, vol. iii, part 1, page 83, *et seq.*

[2] Page 103.

Mr. Palmer attempts to account for the origin of this "unholy tyranny" in another way: he brings up again, for the hundredth time, the stale argument drawn from the spurious decretals, ascribed to Isidore Mercator. This argument had been dead and buried centuries ago; but our Oxfordite calls it up again from the tomb, hoping by the exhibition of the ghastly spectre to frighten—old women and children! for men of sense have long since learned to view it with a steady nerve; that is, if they can check the rising disposition to merriment, at the absurd importance attached to it by some superficial persons! Here are his words:

> "The power of the Roman see in the western church was greatly augmented in the ninth century, by the fabrication of a large body of decretal epistles or ecclesiastical laws, which purported to have been written by the Popes during the first three centuries, and in which the judgment of all bishops, the holding of all councils, and a right to hear appeals from all ecclesiastical judgments, were claimed for the Roman Pontiffs," etc.[1]

Mosheim had gone a step farther, and boldly asserted, what our modest historian only plainly intimates, that the Popes themselves were concerned in this fabrication. The truth is, the Popes had nothing at all to do with the collection in question; nor can it be proved that Nicholas I. ever declared those decretals genuine, as Mr. Palmer asserts he did.[2] They were composed and circulated, some time in the eighth century, by some person calling himself *Isidore Mercator* or *Peccator*,[3]—a man so obscure that the learned are not yet agreed as to his origin, or even his name. He appears to have composed the work somewhere in Germany.

---

[1] Pages 103—4.

[2] Ibid. The spurious decretals were circulated in conjunction with many other documents of undoubted genuineness; and the whole collection was soon received as having the force of law. Nicholas I. merely insisted on its authority as law, which it had already acquired by custom. The fact of its genuineness was not so much discussed as assumed. (Cf. *Epist. Nicholai I. Hincmaro Rhemens.*) Some additional light is perhaps thrown on this whole transaction by the fact, that it was not unusual in the fourth, fifth, and following centuries, for authors to write under assumed or fictitious names. Thus the writer who put forth the collection of canonical regulations, called the *Apostolical Constitutions*, probably some time in the fourth century, ascribed those laws to the apostles themselves: though they merely embodied the ecclesiastical discipline of the first four centuries; chiefly that of the Greek church. This collection is certainly spurious; yet it has considerable authority from the fact just named, and from the additional circumstance, that it had great weight in the fourth and following centuries. Isidore's collection borrowed largely from the one just named. In the fifth century, Vigilius Tapsensis composed several works under the fictitious name of *Athanasius;* and some critics believe that he is the real author of the works ascribed to Dionysius, the Areopagite. In those times, men did not care so much for the name of the author, as for the intrinsic merits of his book: and this circumstance may aid us in understanding, why the collection of Isidore was not more critically examined.

[3] Some think that the real author of them was *Benedictus Levita.*

He states himself that his object in writing it was,—not to exalt the privileges of the Roman Pontiffs,—but to save the bishops from being annoyed with unnecessary litigation.

Will it be believed that a man so obscure, and writing in a part of the world so remote from Rome, would have been able to revolutionize public opinion in regard to the power of the Popes? Would a mere pettifogger of the present day be able, by putting out a new body of laws, to change the whole face of the science of jurisprudence, and to make men believe what they had hitherto rejected? It will be said, that this is an enlightened, and that the eighth century was a dark age. But even admitting all this, for the sake of argument, the parallel still holds good; for it requires not enlightenment, but mere common sense,—and men we presume always had common sense,—not to be led away by every driveler who may choose to broach a new system, or to publish a new book.

Had the spurious collection of Isidore contained aught that was not fully conformable to the canonical usages of the eighth and ninth centuries, it would certainly never have obtained the approbation it did receive. It passed current unchallenged, because it did but embody the principles of those and of previous ages. Nor was it entirely a fabrication; it was chiefly a tissue of passages extracted from the councils and fathers of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries. The only fault of the writer was, to have placed these words in the mouths of the Popes of the first three centuries. This, though a serious fault in criticism, was yet not one which seriously affected the substance of things. Something more than mere assertion will be necessary to prove that the principles embodied in this collection were new and before unheard of; or that the action on them by the Roman Pontiffs was generally resisted by "the bishops, especially those of France,"—as Mr. Palmer tells us.[1]

It could be easily proved, that all the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiffs,—"the judgment of all bishops, the holding of all councils, and a right to hear appeals from all ecclesiastical judgment,"—which our flippant historian assures us were first introduced by these false decretals, had been already generally recognized and brought into action for many centuries before.

Had not the third and fourth canons of the great council of Sardica, in the middle of the fourth century, expressly recognized the right of the Roman Pontiffs to receive appeals from all parts of Christendom, especially in controversies regarding bishops? Had not the Bishops of Rome exercised this right of their see from the very beginning, not only in the west but also in the east? Had not Pope Julius I. written to the Arians of the east, who had condemned St. Athanasius, as follows: "Were you ignorant that *it was customary* that we should be written to first, that *hence the first decision might issue?*" And does not the

---

[1] Ibid.

Greek historian, Sozomenus, speaking of this letter of Julius, say: "There was a sacerdotal law, that those things should be held *null* and *void*, which were done *against* or *without the sanction of the Roman Bishop?*"[1] Had not the legate of the Roman see, in the general council of Chalcedon, (A. D. 451,) composed almost entirely of Greek bishops, insisted successfully on the exclusion from the council, of Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, on the ground that he "had presumed and dared to celebrate a general synod without the authority of the holy see, *which never had been allowed, never had been done?*"[2]

A volume might be filled with such facts; but these will suffice to prove, that the spurious decretals effected no change whatever in the relations of the Church to the Roman Pontiffs.[3]

We must briefly advert to one more topic, and then we will close our remarks on the present epoch. Mr. Palmer tells our roundly, that the Greek schism was caused by the ambition of the Roman Pontiffs: "the east and the west were estranged by the ambition of the Roman Pontiffs."[4] Nothing could be more unfounded than this assertion. All the documents of history conspire to prove, that it was the unhallowed ambition of the bishops of Constantinople, and not that of the Roman Pontiffs, which originated and consummated this deplorable division of the Church. The see of Constantinople — called Byzantium before it became the seat of empire under Constantine the Great in 330 — was not even one of those which had been founded by the apostles or their immediate disciples. Originally it had no pre-eminence whatever; its bishops were merely the suffragans of Heraclea, the metropolis of Thrace. For the first three hundred and fifty years of the Christian era, it was never even mentioned among the principal sees. During all this time, there were only three great patriarchates, which ranked as follows: first, that of Rome; second that of Alexandria; third, that of Antioch.[5] This order of pre-eminence was generally recognized, and was followed in the proceedings of the first general council, — that of Nice, in 325.

It is curious to mark the various successive steps, by which this original order of things was disturbed, and the bishops of Constantinople arose to eminence by their own restless ambition, aided by the influence of the Greek emperors. This powerful influence repressed, if it did not silence, the murmurs of the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, who could not but view with some displeasure this sudden elevation of the bishops of the imperial city, to the prejudice of their own long established rights. The first step was taken in the second general council convened at Constantinople, in the year 381, for the condemnation of the heresy of Macedonius, bishop of that city, — and we may remark here, *en passant*, that the bishops of Constantinople originated three at least, if not more, of the great heresies which disturbed the early Church!

---

[1] Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. iii, cap. x.

[2] "Quia præsumpsit, et ausus est synodum generalem facere sine auctoritate sedis Apostolicæ, quod *nunquam licuit, nunquam. factum est.*" — *Concil. Chalced. Act.* 1. Cf. Archbishop Kenrick "on the Primacy."

[3] This whole subject is handled by Palma with his usual learning and ability. — *Prælectiones*, tom. ii, part II, p. 124, *et seq.* See also Archbishop Kenrick "on the Primacy."

[4] P. 5.

[5] That of Jerusalem was of subsequent date.

The third canon of this council enacted, that "the bishop of Constantinople should have the first place of honor *after* the Roman bishop, because Constantinople is the new Rome." This is, to say the least, a very insufficient reason for a plain usurpation: but it marks the *real* source of the pre-eminence claimed by the Constantinopolitan bishops. The Roman see, and the Western Church, never approved of this canon. It was justly viewed as the commencement of an innovation fraught with danger to the Church. The forecast of the Roman Pontiffs has been, alas! but too sadly confirmed by the event.

Emboldened by this partial success, the ambitious bishops of Constantinople went a step farther. After the council of Chalcedon had closed its sessions in 451, and the legates of the Roman see had departed, Anatolius, then bishop of Constantinople, assembled a portion of the eastern bishops, and clandestinely enacted the famous 28th canon of that council which gave to the bishops of the imperial city, for the reason assigned above, *equal* honor and authority with those of Rome: and this too in the face of the solemn declarations of the same council in its sixteenth *action* or session: "We all see that, before all things, the primacy and the principal honor should, according to the canons, be confirmed to the most beloved Arch-bishop of ancient Rome!" It is needless to observe, that Pope St. Leo the Great, and with him all the western Church, strongly condemned this canon.

We pass over the arrogant assumption by John the Faster,—another bishop of Constantinople,—of the lofty title of *œcumenical* or *universal* bishop,—an attempt for which he was well rebuked by Pope St. Gregory the Great. We omit also to refer to some further indications of a similar pride in the proceedings of the Greek council in Trullo, in 692; or to the ambitious attempts of the bishops of Constantinople to encroach on the jurisdiction of the Roman patriarchate.[1] We come down immediately to Photius in the ninth century, who was certainly an ambitious usurper, foisted into the see of Constantinople by the power of the imperial court. His consecration was in every respect uncanonical and irregular; Rome very properly raised her voice against it, and succeeded in having the sainted Ignatius, the lawful bishop, re-established in his see. The schism was thus crushed for a time; but Photius was a man of great talent and versatility, and as untiring in his efforts as he was unprincipled. He succeeded, but too well, in poisoning the minds of many among the Greek bishops against Rome; and he was enabled to exercise this baneful influence the more effectually, after he had succeeded, by his arts, in being again constituted bishop of Constantinople, on the death of St. Ignatius.

Two centuries later, this suppressed animosity broke out into an open, and, with two brief intervals excepted, a final rupture with Rome, under the Constantinopolitan bishop, Michael Cerularius. Mr. Palmer himself admits, that this proud man was the aggressor, in the controversy which arose between him and Rome. He tells us that

---

[1] This is acknowledged in substance by Mr. Palmer himself — pp 104, 105.

> "When Cerularius, bishop of Constantinople, wrote to the bishop of Trani in Italy condemning several of the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Church, and shut up the Latin churches and monasteries in Constantinople, the legate of the Roman see, Cardinal Humbert, insisted on his implicit submission to the Pope; and, on his refusal, left an excommunication on the altar of his patriarchal church of St. Sophia at Constantinople."[1]

Among the "rites and ceremonies of the Roman Church" censured by Cerularius in his letter to John, bishop of Trani, were the following:

> "That the Latins did not abstain from things strangled and from blood; that they consecrated in unleavened bread; that *their monks eat hogs' lard*; that their *priests shaved their beards*; that their bishops wore rings like bridegrooms; that fast was kept on Saturday; and that *Alleluia* was not sung in Lent!"[2]

With this brief summary of undoubted facts, we leave our readers to decide, whether it was the ambition of the Roman Pontiffs which caused the Greek schism. We could easily show that in *all* the first eight general councils, composed too almost entirely of Greek bishops, the primacy of the Roman Pontiffs was distinctly and repeatedly recognized; and that in *all* of them the legates of the Roman see presided.[3] We must be content with one or two remarks on the proceedings of the first general council,—that of Nice, in 325.

The sixth canon of this council has often been cited against the primacy; though, even as it now stands, it says nothing opposed to this tenet. In many of the oldest manuscript copies of the Nicene canons, the phrase, "THE ROMAN CHURCH ALWAYS HELD THE PRIMACY,"[4] is inserted at the beginning of this same canon. It was found in the copy used by the Roman Church in the fourth century; and it was read and approved of in the sixteenth session of the council of Chalcedon. The passage which we quoted above from this council, immediately follows the reading of the Nicene canon with the clause referred to. That this clause was also found in the older collections of the Nicene canons, used in the east in the fourth century, would appear from a decree of the Emperor Valentinian against St. Hilary of Arles, in which instrument distinct allusion is made to this portion of the canon: "the *authority of the sacred synod* has confirmed the primacy of the apostolic see of Peter," &c.[5]

But our observations on the present epoch have already extended far beyond what we had originally intended, and though many things yet remain to be noticed, we must hasten on to the next æra.

---

[1] P 106.

[2] See Palma, vol. iii, part i, p. 62 *et seq.*

[3] See, among other writers, Cabassutius—*Notitia Ecclesias.* p. 108, *et seq.* and Archbishop Kenrick "on the Primacy."

[4] Η εκκλησια Ρωμης παντοτε ειχε τα πρωτεια.

[5] Cf Cabassutius, ibid, p. 111, *et seq.* vol. i, fol. Edit. Lugduni, 1702.

EPOCH IV, A. D. 1054—1517.[1]

Our remarks on this period will be necessarily very brief. It was signalized by the final conversion of many of the northern nations, and by the holy lives of such men as St. Anselm, St. Bernard, St. Laurence Justinian, and Thomas à Kempis. Our author furnishes beautiful sketches of the lives of all these illustrious men. We have room only for the following touching anecdote of St. Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, who died, A. D. 1109:

> "He often retired in the day to his devotions, and not unfrequently continued the whole night in prayer. An anecdote has been preserved which shows how continually his mind was engaged on the great and awful realities of religion. One day as he was riding, at one of his manors, a hare pursued by the hounds ran under his horse for refuge; on which he stopped, and the hounds stood at bay. The hunters began to laugh at the circumstance; but Anselm said weeping 'this hare reminds me of a poor sinner on the point of departing this life surrounded by devils waiting to carry away their prey.' The hare going off, he forbade her to be pursued, and was obeyed. In this manner every circumstance served to raise his mind to God; and, in the midst of noise and tumult, he enjoyed all of that tranquility and peace which naturally arose from the continual contemplation of his God and Saviour, and which elevated him above the cares and anxieties of this life."[2]

This is a pretty good specimen of the good old Catholic piety in the middle ages. We doubt very much whether any Protestant archbishop of Canterbury has been endowed with any such sanctity; or whether any one of the modern fox-hunting parsons of the Anglican establishment was ever known to pause in the chase, to make any such pious reflections! What says Bishop Whittingham on this subject? He has not thought it necessary to append a little note here, for our special enlightenment.

We have much fault to find with many of our author's statements during this period; but, strange to say, we have little cause to blame his Right Reverend editor. This probably arises from the fact that his lordship, exhausted perhaps by his previous labors in the field of history, rests his wearied mind during these 364 years somewhat after the manner of the seven sleepers of old. The four small notes which he has dropped might have been penned *inter somnum et vigilias*, for all the importance they possess, or the information they convey! One of them seems to have been written, when he was just beginning to awake from a horrid dream of papal tyranny and "Romish" abominations. We must record this incoherent "note of a dreamer," and then we will leave his lordship to enjoy his slumbers undisturbed.

Mr. Palmer had, in the text, praised the refusal of the Greek church to submit to the primacy of Rome.[3] The episcopal note-maker here breaks forth in the following pious strain:

"It ought not to be overlooked, how the providence of God thus made the Roman attempts at usurpation (!) provide an insuperable bar

---

[1] From p. 106 – 146. [2] Pages 120, 121. [3] Page 130.

> to the subsequent claim of Catholicity to Romish (!) corruptions in doctrine and practice. The latter *might* have become universal but for the hostility awakened by the former."[1]

We will pass over the rhetoric of this passage. Now for the logic. If the "Romish" Church was not then Catholic, pray what church was? Was the Greek church,—confined as it certainly was to a comparatively small portion of the earth,—endowed with this attribute of universality? Though even this would not be so palpably absurd, as the pretension of the Anglican church to be the Church Catholic! As well might Bishop Whittingham pretend that Maryland is the whole world! Or had the Catholic Church, which the bishop professes to believe in, as often as he recites either of the two creeds still held by his church, vanished entirely from the face of the earth? What then became of the solemn promises of Christ? Besides it is truly unfortunate for the worthy editor's argument, that the Greek church then held, and still holds those identical "corruptions in doctrine and practice" which so much excite his bile against the "Romish" Church; and, as far at least as these are concerned, she agreed and yet agrees with the Roman Church. Perhaps the obstinate repugnance of the Greeks to the shaving of the beard, and to the use of hogs' lard by the monks, destroyed the Catholicity of the Church! We had quite forgotten this! We give it up!

We will now glance rapidly at some of the leading inaccuracies of our historian in matters of fact. Speaking of the primacy, he uses this sweeping language:—

> "As for the eastern churches they rejected and denied this novel(!) doctrine which was never declared to be an article of faith by any general synod; for the synod of Lyons, in which this doctrine was advanced by the ambassadors of the Greek emperor to gratify the Pope, and by some Greek bishops who acted under intimidation; and the synod of Florence, in which it was forced on those Greek bishops who were present, were rejected by the Greek church. The latter synod, indeed, was of doubtful authority even in the west, as it consisted only of Italian bishops, while the rival synod of Basle was sitting at the same time."[2]

There are at least six palpable misstatements in this extract, besides other smaller ones expressed or implied.

1. It is not true, that this was a *novel* doctrine, as we have already shown. 2. It is not true, that this article was not defined by any general synod: it had been expressly declared to be the faith of the Church, and had been acted on as such, in every one of the six first general councils, which our author himself admits to have been œcumenical. This we have also seen. 3. It is not true that the Greek church, at least at first, rejected the general synod — the second of Lyons — held in 1274. They subsequently refused to admit its authority, but they had already approved of it, through their regular representatives at the council. 4. The same must be said of the council of Florence, which was only subsequently

---

[1] Note, *ibid.*

[2] Page 116.

rejected by the Greeks, chiefly through the perfidious conduct of Mark, bishop of Ephesus. This instability of the Greeks only proved the proverbial Greek faith—the *Græca fides*; but it did not invalidate the acts of the councils in question, any more than the rejection of the first general council of Nice by the Arians had rendered null its doctrinal decisions.

5. There is no evidence to prove that, in the general council of Lyons, "the ambassadors of the Greek emperor" advocated the primacy to "gratify the Pope," or that in it "the Greek bishops acted under intimidation." This is all a paltry suspicion unworthy of an historian. This same council of Lyons was one of the most numerous that was ever convened: it was composed of five hundred bishops, both Latin and Greek, besides one thousand abbots and distinguished divines: and it certainly clearly represented the whole Church.

6. It is not true, that the council of Florence "was of doubtful authority, even in the west." The "rival synod of Basle" had degenerated into a schismatical conventicle, which had very few adherents; and the whole western Church very soon after received the decrees of the Florentine council. Its canons were universally viewed as having emanated from a general council; at least those which had been enacted before the departure of the Greek bishops;—including the famous definition on the primacy, which was signed by the bishops of both the Greek and Latin churches. It is not true, that this synod "consisted only of Italian bishops;" the Greek church was certainly represented in it by some of its bishops; and after the departure of these, the Armenian and Jacobite, and subsequently the Abyssinian bishops sanctioned its decrees, and were re-united to the Roman Church.[1] Were not the six general councils which Mr. Palmer receives, composed almost entirely of Greek bishops? Was the Latin Church as fully represented in any of them, as was the Greek Church in those of Lyons and Florence?

We should be endless were we to undertake the refutation of all the historical blunders, which our author has scattered over the pages that treat of this epoch. Here, for instance, is another curious extract from the same page as the one just given:

> "The synod of Florence, just alluded to, was the first which taught the doctrine of purgatory as an article of faith. It (*not the synod, but the doctrine*) had indeed been held by the Popes and by many writers; and it became the popular doctrine during the period under review; but it was not decreed by any authority of the universal, or even the whole Latin Church. In the eastern church it was always rejected."

Even admitting, for the sake of argument, that the council of Florence was the first which defined this doctrine as an article of faith, would it thence follow that the doctrine itself was of recent origin? It could only be inferred that it was never before questioned; and that, therefore, there was no need of any definition on the subject. Would it follow from the fact, that the council of Nice was the first general synod which defined the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, that this too was a new doctrine, unknown to the three previous centuries? Mr. Palmer himself admits, that this tenet of purgatory "had become the popular doctrine during the period under review;" which, in connection with the solemn promises of Christ to guard his Church from error, clearly proves that it was an article of divine revelation,—on the principles even of our Oxford divine!

---

[1] Cabassutius, *Notitia Ecclesiastica*, in Concilia Lugdun. II, et Florentinum.

It is not true, that "it was always rejected in the eastern church." The Greek church admitted it in the council of Florence, and, at least, impliedly, in that of Lyons. It had never been a bar to union between the churches, however their theologians may have differed on the secondary question,—whether the souls detained in this middle place of temporary expiation, are purified by a material fire? The ancient fathers, both of the Greek and Latin Church, who had occasion to refer to the subject, had unanimously agreed in maintaining the doctrine, as could be easily shown by reference to their works.[1] All the ancient liturgies of both churches had embodied this same article of faith. And even at present, not only the Greek church, but all the oriental sectaries still hold it as doctrine, and practice accordingly.

We are prepared to prove all this, and more besides. Let Bishop Whittingham only deny *one* of these facts, and we promise him proof to his heart's content.

We are also amply provided with proof to establish the falsity of the following statement, which we merely give as a specimen of Oxford skill in mystification:

> "The council of Lateran (the fourth of that name, A. D. 1215,) indeed, had made use of the word *transubstantiation* to express the change by which the bread and wine become the sacrament of Christ's body and blood; but this word might be, and in fact was, used in many senses inconsistent with the Romish interpretation of it; and the object of the synod itself seems to have been merely to establish the old doctrine of the presence and reception of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, in opposition to the Manichean errors."

This is, indeed, a curious piece of absurdity. It is worthy of Dr. Pusey himself. So Rome, we presume, must go to Oxford, before she can learn her own doctrines aright! This same doctrine of transubstantiation, besides being perhaps the clearest of all the doctrines contained in the Bible, could be also established by whole volumes of ancient testimony.[2]

Our historian tells us the truth,—who would have thought it?—about the doctrine of indulgences; but he complains, singularly enough, that their too great extension ruined the ancient penitential discipline of the Church:

---

[1] See their testimonies accumulated in the "Faith of Catholics," *sup. cit.* See also the learned work of the Greek, Leo Allatius—"De Consensu Orientalis Ecclesiæ, &c., in dogmate Purgatorii." 1 Vol. 12mo. This work exhausts the subject. Wonder if Mr. Palmer ever heard of this learned publication!

[2] See "Faith of the Catholics."—*sup. cit.*

"The plenary indulgence which the Popes issued, first to the crusaders, but afterwards to many other persons, completed the ruin of the penitential discipline of the Church. These indulgences, or pardons, were the remission of the lengthened works of penitence imposed by the ancient canons. All that was necessary to obtain them, was to confess to a priest all past sins (with true sorrow and purpose of amendment, we add,) to go to the crusade in Palestine or in some other country, or to perform some other work assigned by the Pope."[1]

One would think that this *all* was a great deal. Protestants have granted a much more ample indulgence than this:—they have abolished penitential works altogether, and with them every thing that is in any way painful to human nature! Theirs is at least a very easy way to heaven, provided it be only safe. They—the Anglican "Church Catholic" (!) always included—have swept off entirely, at one fell stroke, the whole ancient "penitential system of the Church." Why does not Mr. Palmer, and why does not the Protestant bishop of Maryland, make *some* effort to restore this same ancient penitential system?

Our author says, that the scapular "was now worn by some persons as a sort of charm;"[2]—we thought it was worn only as a *badge* of a pious confraternity. He ridicules the idea of the commutation of one penance for another, and laughs at St. Peter Damian for affirming,—for which fact we have only his bare word,—"that the repetition of the psalter twenty times accompanied by discipline (that is, scourging,) was equal to a hundred years of penitence."[3] This he calls an ingenious way of "paying the debt."[4] Protestants have discovered a far more ingenious way of paying this same debt of penance,—they have *repudiated* it altogether!

He cannot bear the idea of "sackcloth or haircloth worn next the skin, by way of voluntary mortification."[5] It is absolutely shocking to his delicate nerves, only to think of this cruel infliction! Nor can he relish the devotion of the rosary, introduced by St. Dominic. The Protestant sense of smell has become, alas! too obtuse to perceive the delightful fragrance of this sweet chaplet of *roses*, woven in honor of her,—"the pure and holy one,"—who is

"Our tainted nature's solitary boast."[6]

Though, in truth, the honor is given chiefly to her divine Son, from whom all her beauty is borrowed, and on whom it is again reflected back. "The sensual man perceiveth not the things which are of the Spirit of God: for it is foolishness to him, and he cannot understand; because it is spiritually examined."[7]

Our author complains of the power of the Popes during this period; he denominates it "the grand and crying evil of these ages."[8] He tells us two or three "rousing" ones, about the sainted Gregory VII;[9] which he would have himself detected as such, had he only opened the life of this great Pontiff, lately written by the Protestant historian, Voigt. He gives us an absolutely incredible account of some disputes between the Pope and the bishops of England:[1] but he takes special care not to give us the name of the Pope in question, though we *guess* he means the great Innocent IV.; nor does he furnish any authority whatever for his statement. We enter a simple denial of the entire account, and challenge proof. The author, in fact, seems to become absolutely unsettled in mind, whenever the Popes and his own dear England come into collision; or even when, without coming into actual conflict, they appear at all on the arena.

---

[1] P. 133. [2] P. 142. [3] P. 141. [4] Ibid. [5] P. 142.
[6] Wordsworth. [7] 1 Cor. ii, 14. [8] P. 132. [9] P. 133

He should have borne in mind, that, but for the efforts of the Popes, and for the power they acquired in temporal matters by the free consent of the European nations, Europe would, in all human probability, never have arisen from barbarism nor progressed in civilization. That power was almost always put in requisition to check tyranny, and to succor the oppressed. The voice of Rome liberated the captive, struck off the chains of the serf, cheered the oppressed, and struck terror into the hearts of tyrants. Protestants have admitted all this.

Though we have marked many other passages for animadversion, yet we must here close our imperfect notice of the present epoch.

---

[1] P. 135, *et seq.*

III. CHURCH HISTORY.*

ARTICLE III.—THE REFORMATION AND SINCE.

Necessity of calm impartiality — Protestant and Catholic views of reformation — Wickliffe and Huss — Oriental languages — Foreign and British reformation — Luther and Carlostadt - Curious anachronism —Luther and Episcopacy — Anglican branch of the reformation — "Scruples of Henry VIII." — The new Gospel light — The Anglican Pope — Royal prerogative predominant — Cromwell Vicar General— Base servility of first Anglican Bishops—Fisher and Moore — Burning Protestants and Catholics — Palmer's theory of Anglican reformation examined — Downright tyranny — Trait of noble independence — Edward VI. — Married clergy — *Improvements* of Anglican liturgy — Return to unity under Mary — Bull of St. Pius V. — Henry's divorce — Reformation in Ireland — How the Anglican church was *persecuted* in Ireland — Dr. Lingard's testimony and proofs — Anglican saints — Ridley — McCauley's portrait of Cranmer — A parallel — Infidelity of Protestant origin — Anglican infidels — Suppression of Anglican convocation — Church and state —Where Voltaire learned infidelity — Infidels in Protestant Europe — French clergy during the Revolution — Did the French Revolution make any *Protestant* martyrs? —Conclusion.

We have now reached the fifth and last epoch of Church History, according to Mr. Palmer's division. It embraces the period intervening between the year 1517, — the date of the reformation, *so called,* — and the year 1839, — when our historian's work was published.

This is the most important and exciting era of ecclesiastical history. It is difficult to approach it with that even temper of mind, which is absolutely necessary to form a right judgment on its many startling events. Men are too apt to view these through the medium of their preconceived opinions; and we are not at all astonished that our Oxford historian, who had already given so much evidence of deep prejudice, should here have exhibited himself the thorough partisan. He hazards the following opinion as to the general character of this whole period: —

> "Fifthly, the epoch (1517 — 1839) when a reformation being called for, was resisted by those who ought to have promoted it; when the western Church became divided; and at length infidelity came to threaten universal destruction."[1]

We would have drawn a different picture altogether of the period in question. We would have designated it as the epoch when a reformation having been called for in a violent and tumultuous manner, — by persons too who wished, under pretext of reform, to undermine the ancient faith, and who could not agree among themselves as to the nature or measure of the reformation asked for; — the demand was met by the Church in

---

***A Compendious Ecclesiastical History, from the earliest period to the present time.* By the Rev. William Palmer, M. A., of Worcester College, Oxford. With a Preface and Notes, by an American Editor. New York, 1841, republished. 1 Vol., 12mo. pp. 228.

[1] P. 5. *sup cit.*

the only legal way, — by convening a general council to decide on the doctrinal points called in question, and to devise the most suitable remedies for existing evils in local discipline or morals; — when the decisions of this council having been rejected by those who had clamored for reform, and who had themselves appealed to its authority, these became estranged from the Church, and split up into sects almost innumerable; — and when finally the unsettling of faith, caused by this multiplication of sects, led men naturally to the frightful abyss of infidelity. This picture is much more conformable to the facts of history, even as Mr. Palmer reads them; and this we hope to prove in the course of the present paper.

Of Wickliffe and Huss, the boasted precursors of the reformation, our author writes as follows:

> "Wickliffe had, in the preceding century, declaimed against the Popes and against several abuses, and he was closely followed by Huss and Jerome of Prague: but their opinions were mingled with much that was exceptionable, and they seem to have been unfitted rightly to conduct the mighty work of reformation."[1]

This is a very mild censure of men who were firebrands in society, and whose principles led directly to sedition, and to the breaking up of all social order. But still, mild as was the reproof, it seems greatly to have shocked the sensibility of Bishop Whittingham, who here drops this little note: "More ought to have been said of this great precursor of the reformation."[2] We think ourselves that the great Captain of the Lollards was treated with some neglect by the Puseyite historian; and merely to satisfy the bishop, we will here give a few, out of the many strange doctrines, broached by this great precursor of the reformation. They are taken, almost at random, from a list of forty-five propositions extracted from his writings, and condemned in the council of Constance,[3] in 1415.

"Prop. IV. If a bishop or priest be in the state of mortal sin, he does not validly ordain, nor consecrate, nor administer the sacraments, nor baptize.

"Prop. VI. God ought to obey the devil. (!)[4]

"Prop. XXVII. All things happen through absolute necessity.

"Prop. XXIX. Universities, places for study, colleges, taking out degrees, (*graduationes*) and professorships, were borrowed from paganism, and are of as much profit to the Church as the devil. (!)

"Prop. XXXII. To endow the clergy is against the law of Christ.

"Prop. XLIII. Oaths are unlawful, when they are taken to confirm contracts among men, or for commercial purposes."

We wish the bishop much joy of his "great precursor," who seems to have had a wonderful taste for letters, and to have taken a strange fancy for the evil one! The bishop would do well, before he attempt to administer the sacraments in future, or to make his visitation, to examine carefully whether he be in the state of sin, otherwise his acts might be wholly invalid; and if he have any worldly gear, we would advise him by all means to give it to the poor without delay, as he would be else sinning against the law of Christ!

---

[1] P. 146.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Sessione VIII.
[4] Deus debet obedire diabolo.

Among the causes which prepared the way for the reformation, Mr. Palmer places the following:—

> "The introduction of the Greek and Hebrew languages (entirely unknown during the middle ages) rendered the study of the Scriptures in the original languages possible."[1]

In the assertion made in *parenthesis*, there is either a woful ignorance of history, or a willful misstatement. The Oxford divine may select between these two horns of the dilemma:—there is no escape. We might accumulate evidence to prove, that not only the Greek and Hebrew, but other oriental languages, were cultivated to a considerable extent during the middle ages. Is Mr. Palmer ignorant of the fact, that Cassiodorus, as early as the sixth century, revived the study of Greek literature in Italy, and that Theodorus, archbishop of Canterbury, introduced the same study into England, in the seventh century? *Can* he have been ignorant that many men, during that whole period, copied and collated the Greek and Hebrew manuscripts of the holy Scriptures? Has it wholly escaped him, that, about the year 1285, Pope Honorius IV., founded, in the university of Paris, a distinct professorship for the cultivation of the oriental languages, with a view to prepare missionaries for the provinces of Asia;[2] and that Pope Clement V., in 1311, founded professorships of Hebrew, Greek, Arabic, and Syriac? How, in fact, could the missions of the east, which we know flourished greatly in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, have been carried on at all, without an extensive acquaintance with the oriental languages?

Our historian speaks very differently of what he calls the "foreign reformation,"[3] and of that which took place in the British churches. He finds much to censure in the former, more however as to its manner than its matter; the latter is entirely after his own heart. We said in our first paper, that his book was Church History set to Puseyism; and his whole account of the reformation, both on the continent and in England, affords a clear proof of our assertion. He grievously misstates on almost every page. We have not space to notice, much less to refute *all* his errors in matters of fact. We will briefly unfold his theory, and then advert to some of his more egregious blunders.

He laments the manner in which the foreign reformation commenced:—

> "At length the reformation began; but not as it could have been desired; not promoted by the heads of the church, not regulated by the decrees of councils."[4]

---

[1] Pages 146—7.

[2] It is but fair, however, to say, that this design of the enlightened Pontiff was not immediately carried into full execution, at least in the university of Paris.

[3] That in Germany, and on the continent of Europe.

[4] P. 171.

After having spoken of the papal bull against Luther, he remarks:—

> "Luther and his friends Melancthon, Carlostadt, and all who were of the same sentiments, were thus separated from the communion of the Pope, and of his adherents in Germany not voluntarily, or by their own act."[1]

A little further on he says:—

> "It is to be lamented, however, that the Lutherans after a time forgot that their system was merely provisional, and designed only to last till a general council could be lawfully assembled. They then began to pretend that their ancestors had separated *voluntarily* from the western church, and justified this act by reasons which sanctioned schism and separation generally."[2]

These passages exhibit the gist of his theory. Perhaps the reader will incline to the opinion, that the Lutherans were much better judges of their real position than the Oxford divine. If the latter has read history aright, he must have come to the conclusion, that Rome had exhausted every expedient of clemency and forbearance, ere she struck the blow which separated the adherents of Luther from the Catholic Church; and that even after the bull had been fulminated, she left no means untried to reclaim those deluded men who were obstinately bent on separation. For this purpose embassy after embassy was sent into Germany; nor did this commendable solicitude cease until after the year 1535, when the outrageous treatment by Luther of the legate Vergerio, sent by Pope Paul III., cut off all hopes of conciliation.[3] The appeal by Luther to a general council,—as the event proved,—was merely a crafty expedient to gain time: his real and fixed purpose, almost from the beginning, was to FORCE a separation from the Church; and not all the efforts of the Roman Pontiffs and of the general council of Trent subsequently convened, could prevent this unhappy result.

The reader, who is at all conversant with the history of those times, can scarcely repress a smile when he hears it gravely asserted, that "Luther and his friend Carlostadt were of the same sentiments." They agreed about as well as fire and water; and the same may be said of all the leading reformers. It would puzzle even a Puseyite to reconcile Mr. Palmer's assertion, that the bull of excommunication against Luther was fulminated in the year 1521,[4] with the notorious fact, that Luther had burned this same bull at Wittemberg on the 10th of December, in the previous year 1520! Still greater ingenuity would be required to reconcile our author's flippant assertion, that "episcopacy was never rejected by the Lutherans,"[5] with the certain fact, that Luther, the father of the sect, was violently opposed to it during his whole life, and wrote a most inflammatory work against it.[6] This, with some other works of a similar character, drew from the Protestant historian Hallam the pungent remark, that the arch-reformer's writings were little more than "a bellowing in bad Latin."

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] P. 150.

[3] See Audin's Life of Luther, p. 472, *et seq.*

[4] P. 147.

[5] P. 150.

[6] '*Contra falso nominatum ordinem episcoporum.* Though leveled chiefly at the Catholic bishops, this violent pamphlet aims at nothing less than the destruction of the episcopacy itself.

For the special edification of Mr. Palmer's admirers, we will give one short extract from the publication of Luther just alluded to:

> "Listen, bishops; listen, you vampires and devils! The Doctor comes to read for you a bull, which will make your ears tingle. The bull of Doctor Martin is this: whoever aids with his corporal strength, or with his property, to destroy the episcopacy, and slay the order of bishops, is a cherished child of God, and a good Christian. If he cannot do that, at least let him condemn and avoid this body. Whoever defends the episcopacy, or obeys its mandates, is a minister of Satan. Amen."[1]

We might remark on many other false or unfair statements of our historian in reference to the foreign reformation, for which, notwithstanding his dislike of some of its proceeedings, very feebly expressed, he evidently cherishes a sympathetic feeling, But we must hasten on to his account of the reformation effected in the "British churches," under which name he includes those of Ireland and Scotland. We have already remarked, that whenever his own dear England is concerned, he seems to become absolutely unsettled in mind: and we defy any one to read his very lengthy account of the progress of the reformation in England, Ireland, and Scotland, without being convinced that a little learning and much bigotry "have made him mad." He devotes two whole chapters,[2] extending through thirty-eight pages, to this portion of his history,—if that can be called a history, which is a tissue of false statements almost from beginning to end. His account of what he calls the "Irish church,"[3] is well worthy of the man, who had the heartlessness to write the atrocious libel on the Irish clergy and people, which sometime ago appeared in the London Quarterly Review. Its perusal is enough to make one's blood boil in his veins, even if those veins are not Irish.

He gravely tells us of the "scruples of Henry VIII. as to the lawfulness of his marriage with Catharine, the widow of his elder brother,"[4] and of the manner in which Pope Clement VII. "protracted the affair by various expedients for six years," for which course he can find no better motive than the influence of the Emperor Charles V., Catharine's uncle; and this wise delay of the Pontiff he can ascribe to naught but "the arts and chicanery of the court of Rome."[5] He next proceeds to state that Henry was sustained in his application for divorce by "the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Bologna, Padua, Orleans, Angiers, Bourges, Toulouse, &c., and by a multitude of theologians and canonists;" that the Pontiff still proving untractable, Henry "privately married Anna Boleyn," and that "the convocation of the church of England immediately afterwards declared his former marriage null, and approved that recently contracted."[6]

It is really difficult to have patience with a man, who thus glaringly perverts, or miscolors the plainest facts of history. The *scruples* of Henry the VIII., forsooth! The *scruples* of the man, who was subsequently the murderer of his wives, and the unmitigated tyrant over his people! The *scruples* of the man, of whom it has been truly said, "that he never spared man in his anger, nor woman in his lust!" The *scruples* of the man, who wantoned in the sacrilegious spoliation of the monasteries and sanctuaries of religion, and whom all impartial men of every shade of opinion have long since branded as the Nero of the sixteenth century! The *scruples* of the man, who had already lived in perfect quietude of conscience with Catharine, the best of women and most virtuous of wives, for eighteen long years! She was a woman, too, whom even *he* could not accuse of any crime, except that of having grown old, and of having presented him no male issue;—a woman whom even *he* was compelled to respect to the hour of her death; whose gentleness, magnanimity, and piety, extorted homage from all her cotemporaries and from all posterity; and whose death caused even *him* to relent, to drop the unwilling tear, and to order his whole court to go into mourning!

---

[1] Cf Audin ut sup. p. 248.

[2] Chapters xxii and xxiii, from p. 157 to 196.

[3] P 167, *et seq.*

[4] P. 158.

[5] P. 158—9.

[6] Ibid.

And then, how did these pretended scruples awaken in his mind, after having lain dormant for so many years? How did the new gospel light break upon his hitherto clouded soul? How did he become so very scrupulous all of a sudden? Alas! it is useless to disguise the fact; all history proclaims it, and Henry's own conscience proclaimed it to him at the time. As the poet has caustically, but truly said,—

"The gospel light
First beamed from Anna Boleyn's eyes!"

Tired of an aged and virtuous wife, the royal founder of Anglicanism panted for new nuptials with another, whose youthful charms had already captivated his heart, and whose wily arts had rendered her inexorable to his wishes, except on the condition of supplanting the lawful queen, and becoming herself his queenly consort. The Pontiff was appealed to, to second the plan of the English king, and to grant the necessary dispensation: but the Popes had never flattered the vices of princes; and in this particular instance, Clement VII. would not consent to sacrifice his conscience, to trample upon the holy laws of God, and to be recreant to his duty towards a virtuous and much injured woman. After protracting the affair for some years, during which he tried every possible means to dissuade Henry from his purpose, he was at length compelled to decide against the divorce, on which the English king had already resolved. Henry became indignant; he sacrilegiously usurped the office of head of the Church in England; and the majority of the English bishops, won over by intrigue, worn out by harassing solicitations, or intimidated by menaces, were weak enough to sanction his wicked conduct.

Such is the true history of the origin of the Anglican church. We wish it joy of its first founder and *pope;* — for Henry usurped the office of Pope in England, seized on the first fruits of the benefices which had hitherto been paid to the Roman Pontiffs, and pushed his *papal* prerogative much farther than ever Pope had done before. Instead of the mild and paternal authority of the Roman Pontiffs, who had ever been the champions of the poor and of the oppressed against the rich and tyrants, the Anglican bishops had now to wear, rivited on their necks, an iron yoke which they themselves had aided to forge. The sovereigns of England, whether male or female, whether infants or of mature age, whether sane in mind or idiotic, thus became absolute both in church and state! The only barrier to their tyranny was removed, and the liberties of England, which had been established by Catholics three hundred years before, now lay prostrate and crushed.

The champions of freedom, both civil and religious, were now doomed to atone for their rashness with their blood. The royal prerogative now became unlimited in its extent; it swallowed up every other element of government; and the parliament of England, once the fearless advocate of popular rights, now crouched with mean servility at the foot of a tyrant! And England had to pass through all the horrors of repeated civil wars and oceans of bloodshed, for one hundred and fifty years, ere the kingly power could be again restrained within its ancient constitutional limits, and her parliament could again assert the independence, which had so strongly marked its proceedings in the good old days of Catholicity.

This picture is not only not exaggerated, but it even falls short of the truth, as any one must be convinced who has but glanced at the pages of English history. Mr. Palmer tells us: —

> "The convocation of the clergy in 1531 had acknowledged the king to be head of the Church of England, as far as it is allowable by the law of God;"[1] and that "in virtue of this office, which Henry seems to have understood in a different sense from that of the convocation, he appointed Lord Cromwell his vicar general and visiter of monasteries," &c.[2]

A small portion of the truth here leaks out. Had he been disposed to tell the *whole* truth, he would have stated, that this same Lord Cromwell, from having been the son of a fuller, had, by pandering to Henry's passion, become the first lord of the realm, — placed over the heads of all the princes both spiritual and temporal, and second only to the king himself! He would have told us of the unworthy arts, by which this creeping creature slandered the inmates of the monasteries, and thus succeeded in seizing on their immense property; a large portion of which he embezzled to his own uses, or that of his associates in the sacrilegious robbery. He would have told us, how this same lay vicar general lorded it over the bishops, and compelled them to resign their authority, and to sue out new episcopal powers from the crown:[1] how those bishops were servile enough to submit to this exaction, and humbly to lay their mitres at the foot of the throne; and how the royal letters patent, which contained the strange new episcopal commission, assigned as a reason for this *indulgence* granted to the bishops, "that the king's vicar general, on account of the multiplicity of business with which he was loaded, could not be every where present, and that many inconveniences might arise, if delays and interruptions were admitted in the exercise of his authority."[2]

---

[1] P. 160.

[2] Ibid.

Alas! for the sycophancy of the first Anglican bishops. How it contrasts with the undaunted courage of the English bishops in the good old Catholic times! Where was then the spirit of an Anselm, of a Langton, and of a Thomas à Becket? Was there no *man* among the English bishops of that day? There was one, and but one, — we are pained to avow it, — a venerable octogenarian, the cherished counselor of Henry's father, and his own early preceptor, Fisher, bishop of Rochester: — honor to his gray hairs! *He* would not sacrifice his conscience at the bidding of a tyrant: and his head, which would not bow to an unholy despotism, was struck off by order of Henry! The despot had the heartlessness to taunt this venerable man, who in cosnideration of his transcendent merits had just been named cardinal by Pope Paul III., with this inhuman jeer: "Paul may send him the hat, I will take care that he have never a head to wear it on."[3]

Another illustrious hero, perhaps the greatest man then in England, fell a victim to Henry's tyranny. Sir Thomas Moore, lately lord chancellor of England, would not subscribe to the new doctrine of the king's supremacy. After a mock trial, in which all the forms of law were openly set at defiance, he was condemned to die the death of a traitor. And this hard lot befel every man, who had the conscience and the courage to resist Henry's will, in this or in any other particular! Protèstants and Catholics were tied together and burnt at the same stake, if they ventured to believe more or less than suited the royal standard. No one *can*, or will even *dare* deny these facts; and yet we hear men coolly talking of Henry's scruples!

Is it possible, that a church, which originated under these circumstances, was the Church of Christ? Is it credible, that that was the Church of Christ, which came into existence at the bidding of a tyrant, which changed in each successive reign according to the royal pleasure and the will of the parliament, and the liturgy of which was moulded and remoulded, time and again, according to the caprice of the sovereign, male or female, who chanced to be reigning at the time?

We know now what value to set on the oft repeated assertion of our author, that by the general consent and voice of the English bishops and clergy, "the ordinary jurisdiction of the Pope over England was regularly and lawfully suppressed."[1] This is, in fact, according to his theory, the distinguishing feature of the English reformation; this the greatest boast of its advocates. These contend that the English church reformed itself by its own free and spontaneous act; and that in asserting its independence of Rome it merely re-established its ancient rights. We have already seen how entirely unfounded is the pretension set forth in the last clause. It is easy to show that the other assertion, on which the theory mainly rests, is a mere assumption, wholly unsustained by evidence.

---

[1] See Lingard's History of England — Henry VIII., p. 178. First American edition. Philadelphia, 1827.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Lingard, ibid. p. 171.

Was that a *free* consent, which was extorted by menaces, backed by the halter and the stake? Was that a regular and lawful proceeding, which was every where marked by violence? The English bishops had but the alternative; to subscribe to the supremacy of Henry, or to lay their heads on the block. Most of them chose the former, yet not without great and manifest reluctance. The opposition to the arbitrary proceedings of the king and of his vicar general, was both wide spread and deeply seated; but its murmurs were soon stifled in the blood of those who thus had the courage even to whisper dissent.

To silence this opposition, Henry issued injunctions "that the very word *Pope* should be carefully erased out of all books employed in the public worship; that every schoolmaster should diligently inculcate the new doctrine to the children entrusted to his care; that all clergymen, from the bishop to the curate, should on every Sunday and holiday teach that the king was the true head of the Church; and that the authority hitherto exercised by the Popes was a usurpation, tamely admitted by the carelessness or timidity of his predecessors; and that the sheriffs in each county should keep a vigilant eye over the conduct of the clergy, and should report to the council the names, not only of those who might neglect these duties, but also of those who might perform them indeed, but *with coldness and indifference*."[2]

Was there ever tyranny like this? We know of scarcely a parallel to it, save in the similar proceedings which were adopted towards the bishops and clergy in the subsequent reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth. If there is any truth in history, or any reliance to be put in the statute book of England, the whole reformation in that country was the offspring of guilty passion, and the work of violence and tyranny. Had there been in that kingdom a greater number of such men as Fisher and Moore, or had the English bishops possessed aught of the spirit which did so much honor to many of the monks, the bluff old tyrant, Henry, and his mischievous and barren progeny,—Edward and Elizabeth—might have been foiled in their wicked attempt to break up Christian unity.

Every one knows the noble reply of the two friars, Peyto and Elstow, to the barbarous threat of Cromwell — "that they deserved to be enclosed in a sack and thrown into the Thames." "Threaten these things," they said, "to rich and dainty folk, which are clothed in purple, fare deliciously, and have their chiefest hopes in this world. We esteem them not. We are joyful, that for the discharge of our duty we are driven hence. With thanks to God, we know that the way to heaven is as short by water as by land, and therefore care not which way we go."[1]

---

[1] P. 160.

[2] Statute 26 Henry VIII., 1, 3, 13. Wilk. Con. iii, 780—782. Apud Lingard. *ibid.* p. 168.

We have not a doubt, that had the monasteries in England been less wealthy, they would never have been suppressed; and that the body of English bishops would never have apostatized as they did, had they not unhappily belonged to the class of "rich and dainty folk." The wealth munificently bestowed on the Church by Catholic piety during the middle ages, and which, before the reformation, had been employed in erecting noble edifices to religion and to charity, thus became ultimately injurious in its influence on the English church. It was a rich bait to the avarice of those who clamored for reform, and the fear of its loss was a powerful inducement to the bishops and higher clergy to side with Henry VIII. The apostacy once consummated, this same mass of wealth was a golden chain of iniquity, which strongly and sweetly bound the Anglican bishops to the new order of things.

And we really know of no means by which the Anglican church can be again restored to Catholic unity, but the breaking of this same chain by the state, and the abandonment of that church to its own resources. Timid Puseyism would then probably ripen into open Catholicism; its crooked ways would then be made straight; and its many tortuous windings would give place to the one straight path which leads to the holy city of God. Till the English church establishment be broken up,—till this great fountain of evil be removed, we are far from being sanguine in the hope, that England is likely to return to the bosom of Catholic unity. Here and there, a disinterested and generous individual may break his chains, and assert his indèpendence of a corrupt establishment; but, at least humanly speaking, we see little reason to believe that this blessed result will become general in England.

We should be endless were we to notice all the unfounded and absurd statements of our author on the English reformation. He says:

> "On the death of Henry VIII., in 1547, and the accession of Edward VI., the work of the reformation proceeded freely. . . . . . The clergy were permitted to marry, and the public prayers were translated from the old Latin offices of the English church, with various improvements(!) from the Greek and oriental liturgies."[2]

The permission of the clergy to marry was a decided improvement, not only on the ancient discipline of the Catholic Church, but also on the example and earnest advice of St. Paul.[3] Henry VIII., though he dearly prized the privilege of a young wife for himself, was so cruel as to deny this indulgence to his clergy;[1] but the "boy king," it seems, was more tender-hearted!

---

[1] Apud Lingard. *ibid.* p. 169.

[2] P 161.

[3] See 1 Cor vii, entire chapter.

The improvements in the English liturgy were indeed many and various: first, the idea of the real presence and of a true sacrifice, which had been deemed essential to every previous liturgy, whether Latin, Greek, or Oriental, was carefully excluded; and secondly, the liturgy itself was studiously *amended* at least three times, just as the English parliament happened to become more enlightened! There was surely no lack of improvement!

It is really curious to observe, how our author laments the return of the Anglican church to Catholic unity under Mary.[2] The voluntary consent of the parliament and bishops; which had "regularly and lawfully" suppressed the power of the Pope, was incompetent, it seems, to restore that same power: the bishops who were then put into the sees which had been desecrated by intruders under the reign of Edward VI., were themselves but "popish intruders," who, under the "illustrious Elizabeth, were expelled by the civil power:"[3] and under this *virgin* queen, the Church of England was again established on a permanent basis! We scarcely have so poor an opinion of Mr. Palmer's intellect, as to suppose, even for a moment, that he could really have been serious while writing out these palable absurdities.

If any thing can surpass the cool assurance of the following passages, we must say, that we have not chanced to meet with it in all our reading. We give them for what they are worth; merely premising, that in the first he is speaking of the bull of St. Pius V., which excommunicated Elizabeth and her adherents: —

> "This bull caused the schism in England; for the popish party, which had continued in communion with the Church of England up to that time, during the eleven past years of Elizabeth's reign, now began to separate themselves. Bedingfield, Cornwallis, and Silyarde, were the first popish recusants; and the date of the Romanists in England, as a distinct sect or community, may be fixed in the year 1570."
>
> "King James I. wisely (!) discouraged the Roman schism, and forbade the residence of its bishops, priests, and Jesuits in his dominions; but under his successor Charles I., a relaxation of this wholesome severity encouraged the schismatics to insult and disturb the Church, and ultimately, in 1641, to massacre in cold blood one hundred and fifty thousand of its adherents, and to break into insurrection."[4]

We had also intended to insert here another extract[5] breathing a similar spirit, in which Mr. Palmer clearly approves of the late high-handed tyranny of the king of Prussia in imprisoning some Catholic bishops; and we had also purposed to examine his flippant statements in regard to the opinions of the universities in the matter of Henry's divorce. But want of space compels us to omit the former, and for the latter, we must be content with a reference, in the margin, to Dr. Lingard's luminous proofs on the subject.[1] He abundantly establishes the fact, that the opinions of all the universities, including the two in England, were obtained by bribery, or were reluctantly given, after the practising, by Henry's agents, of the vilest arts and the lowest trickery.

---

[1] Cranmer, however, outwitted him in this.

[2] P. 162. [3] P. 163. [4] P. 170. [5] P. 200.

We must hasten on in our rapid notice of Mr. Palmer's statements. He devotes four pages[2] to an account of the "churches of Ireland," — and such an account! We sincerely believe that there is nothing to equal it, in reckless mendacity and utter atrocity, in all the volumes which the press has sent forth since it was first put in operation. He begins his history of the reformation in Ireland, in these words:

> "The churches of Ireland have been suffering severely from the persecutions of Romanists for many years past."

And he ends it with this memorable passage:

> "From that period (1798), the Romish party has acquired great political power, and the church has been almost continually persecuted, especially within the last few years, in which the clergy have been reduced nearly to starvation; some have been murdered, and many placed in peril of their lives. To add to their afflictions, the government, in 1833, suppressed ten of the bishoprics on pretense of requiring their revenues for the support of ecclesiastical buildings; although the bishops of Ireland in a body protested against such an act, and offered to pay the amount required from the incomes of their sees, provided that so great an injury were not done to the cause of religion."[3]

The reader may judge of the spirit which pervades the whole account from these two specimens. Only think of it! The miserable faction of self-called reformers, which was thrust upon Ireland by open violence, and by that government too which has ever been the most deadly enemy of her dearest rights, both temporal and eternal; — the faction which has, for the last three hundred years, been sitting, like an *incubus*, upon the green ocean Isle, weighing down her energies, and crushing her people in the dust; — the faction which has been draining her treasure, and, vampire like, sucking her very blood; — the faction which has sowed religious dissensions and civil feuds broadcast on her lovely soil; — the faction which has reveled in the misery and wretchedness of her people, and wantoned in the blood of her murdered sons and daughters: — this same miserable faction now has the effrontery to stand forth, and unblushingly to cry out persecution! O shame! O shame!!

If it was a bitter curse for Ireland, when the Saxon first set foot upon her green soil, it was a curse a hundred fold more dreadful, when the myrmidons of the reformation seized on and desecrated her beautiful churches, and after having plundered them and destroyed her monasteries and houses of education, sat down with complacency amidst the ruins they had caused. And now, for the children of these sacrilegious spoilers of all that she deemed sacred and held dear, to have the assurance to come forth, and to taunt her, whom they have so atrociously injured, with persecution, is really too bad, — it is intolerable. The less the Anglican church says about its doings in Ireland, the better for its advocates. The very name of Ireland should raise a blush upon the cheek of every Anglican, — if English Protestant cheeks *can* blush for any atrocity of which England has been guilty towards that unhappy country.

---

[1] History of England — Henry VIII. — p. 185, *et. seq.*, and note D.

[2] P. 167, *et. seq.*

[3] P. 170

It would be easy for us to prove, that almost every important statement which our author makes on this subject, is not only wholly unfounded, but utterly false. We will notice only a few out of many. Of the first attempt to introduce the reformation into Ireland, under Henry VIII., he says:

> "Henry VIII. caused the papal jurisdiction to be abolished, in 1537, by the parliament (Irish). The bishops and clergy generally assented (!) and several reforms (!) took place during this and the next reign."[1]

Dr. Lingard, himself an Englishman, proves by incontestable evidence, that "Henry's innovations in religion were viewed with equal abhorrence by the indigenous Irish, and the descendants of the English colonists;" that the parliament which abolished the jurisdiction of the Pope was not the true representative of Irish opinion, but the mere echo of English feelings,— a miserable body of mere creatures of the English court, which "one day confirmed the marriage of the king with Anne Boleyn, and the next, in consequence of the arrival of a courier, declared it to have been invalid from the beginning;" that it was impossible to enforce among the Irish people this parliamentary enactment; and that "the two races combined in defence of their common faith," causing "repeated insurrections."[2] All this he proves from the Irish statute book, and from other authentic documents; and, so far as we know, his statement on this subject has never been controverted; his proofs have certainly never been met, nor his arguments answered.

Our author tells us, that—

> "When Elizabeth succeeded, the former laws were revived, the papal power again rejected, and the royal supremacy and the English ritual again introduced. These regulations were approved by seventeen out of nineteen Irish bishops in the parliament of 1560, and by the rest of the bishops and clergy who took the oath of supremacy, and remained in the possession of their benefices. The people also generally acquiesced, and continued to attend on divine service for several years."[3]

We unhesitatingly pronounce all that is contained in the two last sentences utterly untrue, which qualification we apply with still greater emphasis to almost everything that follows on the subject. Dr. Lingard shows from the statute book of Ireland, that "both the nobility and the people abhorred the change in religion, and that the new statutes were carried into execution in those places only where they *could be enforced*

---

[1] Page 167. [2] History of England—Henry VIII.—pp. 246, 247. [3] Page 167.

at the point of the bayonet."[1] Even the heartless tyrant, Henry VIII., could not, either by menaces or bribery, induce more than one of the Irish bishops to apostatize,—Brown, archbishop of Dublin,—and he was an Englishman by birth.[2] Under Edward VI., this supple courtier-prelate induced four other Irish bishops to become as reckless as himself;[3] but in both cases, the archbishops of Armagh,—Cromer and Dowdal,—as well as the great body of the Irish bishops, and clergy remained faithful to the ancient Church and the holy See. Is it to be believed, that during the intervening reign of the Catholic Queen Mary, the Irish Catholic bishops became more inclined to apostatize?

Mr. Palmer devotes an entire chapter[4] to rather lengthy sketches of the lives of various Anglican *saints* and divines. Nicholas Ridley, *the martyr*, stands at the head of the list. He winds up his account of this man with the following pious rhapsody:

> "Thus died the illustrious martyr—or rather thus did he enter eternal life; and it may be said with truth that never, since the days of the apostles, was there a nobler manifestation of Christian faith and heroism. It was worthy of the brightest days of the primitive Church; and not even Polycarp, in the amphitheater of Smyrna, exceeded the glory of Nicholas Ridley."[5]

We apprehend that Polycarp did not change his religious creed, like Ridley; nor, like him, assist in persecuting others for believing more or less than himself. Lingard tells us, on the authority of the State Papers and of Wilkins, that "as under Henry VIII. Ridley had been employed to examine and detect sacramentaries, so, under the son of Henry, (Edward VI.,) he sate in judgment on the condemnation of heretics."[6] We nowhere read that Polycarp retracted his belief to save his life, as Ridley did in prison;[7] much less that he ever turned traitor to his lawful sovereign, and sought to stir up civil war. It was for this crime of treason chiefly, that Ridley suffered death. He had preached openly against Queen Mary, at St. Paul's Cross, London; and he was one of the most influential of those traitors who assisted in setting up the unfortunate Lady Jane Grey. He may do for an Anglican saint; he could never pass the rigid ordeal requisite for canonization in the Catholic Church.

By the way, why did not Mr. Palmer let us have a sketch of the great patriarch of Anglicanism,—a sort of spiritual vicar general under Henry VIII., and the ever pliant tool of this real founder of the Anglican church,—Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury? Was this unscrupulous courtier too bad to be placed even on the calendar of Protestant saints? Was the Oxford divine frightened by the striking likeness drawn of him by the distinguished Protestant writer, Macaulay? He was almost as great a saint as Ridley; in fact, in many respects the former far outstripped the latter.

---

[1] Elizabeth, p. 95. Irish Statutes, 2 Eliz. 1, 2, 3.

[2] Lingard, *sup cit.*—Henry VIII.—p. 246.

[3] Ibid.—Edward VI.—p. 78.

[4] Chap. xxiii.

[5] Page 179.

[6] History of England, vol. vii, p. 195. Edit. Dolman, London, 1845.

[7] He subsequently retracted this retraction, and died with courage.

We subjoin Macaulay's estimate of the English reformation in general, and of the character of Cranmer in particular. :—

> "They (the English Reformers) were,—a king, whose character may be best described, by saying, that he was despotism itself personified; unprincipled ministers; a rapacious aristocracy; a servile parliament. Such were the instruments by which England was delivered from the yoke of Rome. The work, which had been begun by Henry, the murderer of his wives, was continued by Somerset, the murderer of his brother; and completed by Elizabeth, the murderer of her guest.
>
> "If we consider Cranmer merely as a statesman, he will not appear a much worse man than Wolsey, Gardiner, Cromwell, or Somerset; but when an attempt is made to set him up as a saint, it is scarcely possible for any man of sense, who knows the history of the times well, to preserve his gravity. The shameful origin of his history, common enough in the scandalous chronicles of courts, seems strangely out of place in a hagiology. Cranmer rose into favor by serving Henry in the disgraceful affair of his first divorce. He promoted the marriage of Anna Boleyn with the king. On a frivolous pretence, he pronounced it null and void. On a pretence, if possible still more frivolous, he dissolved the ties which bound the shameless tyrant to Anne of Cleves. He attached himself to Cromwell, while the fortunes of Cromwell flourished; he voted for cutting off his head without a trial, when the tide of royal favor turned. He conformed backwards and forwards, as the king changed his mind. While Henry lived, he assisted in condemning to the flames those who denied the doctrine of transubstantiation; when Henry died, he found out that the doctrine was false. He was, however, not at a loss for people to burn. The authority of his station, and of his gray hairs, was employed to overcome the disgust, with which an intelligent and virtuous child regarded persecution.
>
> "Intolerance is always bad; but the sanguinary intolerance of a man who thus wavered in his creed, excites a loathing to which it is difficult to give vent, without calling foul names. Equally false to political and to religious obligations, he was first the tool of Somerset, and then the tool of Northumberland. When the former wished to put his own brother to death, without even the form of a trial, he found a ready instrument in Cranmer. In spite of the canon law, which forbade a churchman to take any part in matters of blood, the archbishop signed the warrant for the atrocious sentence. When Somerset had been, in his turn, destroyed, his destroyer received the support of Cranmer in his attempt to change the course of the succession.
>
> "The apology made for him by his admirers, only renders his conduct more contemptible. He complied, it is said, against his better judgment, because he could not withstand the entreaties of Edward! A holy prelate of sixty, one would think, might be better employed by the bedside of a dying child, than in committing crimes at the request of his disciple. If he had shown half as much firmness when Edward requested him not to commit murder, he might have saved the country from one of the greatest misfortunes that it ever underwent. He became, from whatever motive, the accomplice of the worthless Dudley. The virtuous scruples of another young and amiable mind were to be overcome. As Edward had been forced into persecution, Jane was to be seduced into usurpation. No transaction in our annals is more

unjustifiable than this. To the part which Cranmer, and unfortunately some better men than Cranmer, took in this most reprehensible scheme, much of the severity with which Protestants were afterward treated, must, in fairness, be ascribed.

"The plot failed, Popery triumphed, and Cranmer recanted. Most people look upon his recantation as a single blemish on an honorable life,—the frailty of an unguarded moment. But, in fact, it was in strict accordance with the system on which he had constantly acted. It was a part of a regular habit. It was not the first recantation that he had made; and in all probability, if it had answered his purpose, it would not have been the last. We do not blame him for not choosing to be burnt alive. It is no very severe reproach to any person, that he does not possess heroic fortitude. But, surely, a man who liked the fire so little, should have had some sympathy for others. A persecutor who inflicts nothing which he is not ready to endure, deserves some respect; but, when a man who loves his doctrine more than the lives of his neighbors, loves his own little finger better than his doctrines, a very simple argument *a fortiori*, will enable us to estimate the amount of his benevolence.

"But his martyrdom, it is said, redeemed everything. It is extraordinary, that so much ignorance should exist on this subject. The fact is, if a martyr be a man who chooses to die rather than renounce his opinions, Cranmer was no more a martyr than Dr. Dodd. He died solely because he could not help it. He never retracted his recantation, till he found he had made it in vain. If Mary had suffered him to live, we suspect that he would have heard mass, and received absolution like a good Catholic, till the accession of Elizabeth; and that he would then have purchased, by another apostacy, the power of burning men better and braver than himself."

In this whole matter of Anglican saints, we cannot fail to observe, even in the highly-wrought portraits of our author, a sad want of those qualities which, in the Catholic times, invariably marked the true saint:—humility of heart and action, mortification, disinterestedness, self-devotion, penitential austerities,—such as fasting, long prayers and corporal maceration,—and an entire abstraction from the world.

Mr. Palmer himself furnishes us ample materials for making this comparison. Let the reader only peruse his well-written sketches of the lives of Saints Francis Xavier, Charles Borromeo, Francis de Sales, and Vincent de Paul,[1] and compare their lives and conduct, as there set forth, with the lives and conduct of the Anglican saints alluded to, and he will at once detect which is the genuine, and which the counterfeit. We wish that our limits permitted us to make the comparison in full; but we must forego this pleasure, and leave the readers of Mr. Palmer's book to make it for themselves.

There is, however, one point on which we must dwell for a few moments, ere we bid a final adieu to Mr. Palmer's "Compendious Ecclesiastical History;" we mean the downward tendency of Protestantism, even of Anglican Protestantism, as admitted by himself. Catholic writers have often declared that infidelity is of Protestant origin; and we would ask no better proofs of this assertion than those afforded by our historian's own avowals. We will allege a few of his testimonies bearing on this point. He speaks of the practical tendency of Lutheranism as follows:

---

[1] Chapter xxv.

> "In the middle of the following century (the eighteenth), a spirit of false liberality and skepticism began to infect the Lutheran communities. The Confession of Augsburg, and other formularies of the sixteenth century, to which their ministers had subscribed, lost their authority, and an unbounded freedom of opinion on all points was encouraged. The result was, the rise of a party headed by the notorious Semler, who, under the mask of Christianity, explained away all the doctrines of revelation, denied the miracles and other facts of sacred history, and subverted the genuineness and authenticity of the Bible. This infidelity became dreadfully prevalent among the Protestants of Germany and Denmark, in the course of the last and present centuries; the universities were full of it, the ministers of religion tainted with it; and the Lutheran faith seems under an eclipse, from whence we fervently pray that it may be delivered."[1]

The Calvinistic branch of the reformation did not bear any better fruits. Here is Mr. Palmer's testimony:

> "It may be observed, in general, of the reformed communities in Switzerland, France, and the United Provinces, that they have too generally fallen away from the doctrines originally believed by them, into the Socinian or Arian heresies."[2]

One would have thought, that at least the hopeful branch of the reformation, established by parliament, and by the bayonet,[3] halter, and stake in England, would not have suffered a similar degeneracy. Let us hear what our historian says on this subject,—and surely *he* is an unexceptionable witness.

> "In 1717, a controversy arose on occasion of the writings of Hoadley, bishop of Bangor, in which he maintained that it was needless to believe any particular creed, or to be united to any particular church; and that sincerity or our own persuasion of the correctness of our own opinions (whether well or ill founded), is sufficient. These doctrines were evidently calculated to subvert the necessity of believing the articles of the Christian faith, and to justify all classes of schismatics or separatists from the Church. The convocation deemed these opinions so mischievous, that a committee was appointed to select propositions from Hoadley's books, and to procure their censure; but before his trial could take place the convocation was prorogued by an arbitrary exercise of the royal authority, and has not been permitted to deliberate since. The temporal government, influenced by the schismatics, protected and advanced Hoadley and several persons of similar principles. In 1766, Archdeacon Blackburn, who was supposed to be an Arian, anonymously assailed the practice of subscribing the articles; and in 1772, a body of clergy and laymen petitioned parliament to put an end to it; but their request was refused. Many of these petitioners were secret disbelievers in some of the Christian doctrines."[4]

---

[1] Pp. 150, 151.

[2] P. 152.

[3] In Edward's reign, German troops were employed to enforce the reformation, and to crush an extensive insurrection in Devonshire and Norfolk.

[4] P. 165.

A humiliating avowal, truly, for an Anglican to be compelled to make! At one fell stroke the royal head of the Anglican church swept away forever the convocation of bishops; and for more than a hundred years, this boasted "church Catholic" has been voiceless, and a mere dumb slave, doomed to do the bidding of an inexorable task master. She has been well punished for having cast off, in an evil hour for her, the mild and paternal authority of Rome. She has, unlike the Israelites of old, gone out of the blooming land of the Catholic paradise, and entered again into the dark land of Egyptian servitude. She is a hopeless slave, bound hand and foot: she has no life even, but that which the capricious whim of her royal master or mistress may think proper to breathe into her nostrils! We do not wonder that she is beginning to grow weary of her bondage, and to sigh again for her former independênce. It is, in fact, to this aspiration after spiritual freedom, that we are mainly indebted for the recent Oxford movement. Let us hear what Mr. Palmer, — who ought to know, — testifies on the matter in question: —

> "The church has been suffering much for a long time from appointments to its offices made from unworthy motives. The bishoprics and other dignities were[1] bestowed by the ministers of the crown on men distinguished only by birth or connections. Patronage, in general, was distributed on low and worldly considerations. Theological learning received no encouragement, and active zeal was viewed with jealousy as an approximation to Methodism .... The aspect of the times has since contributed to stimulate the activity of the church. The weakness of the temporal government, and the influence which parties hostile to the church have for the last twenty years exercised over it, have taught the church to depend less on the protection of the state than on the divine blessing," &c.[2]

God grant that the unholy alliance may be forever dissolved, and then we may hope for England's conversion!

It is curious to trace to its proper origin that modern infidelity which lately desolated France, and threatened to ingulf Christianity itself. Nothing is more certain than that it originated in the principles of Protestantism, and first in Protestant countries. Mr. Palmer himself will aid us in proving this position, and in establishing the two following propositions: —First, that in point of time, infidelity obtained a footing in England and Germany much sooner than it did in France; and second, that those who subsequently propagated it in France, had imbibed their false principles, and learned the specious sophistry by which they sought to maintain them, in Protestant England or Germany, but principally in England.

In support of the first proposition, the truth of which every one who has but glanced at history must admit, we have the authority of Mr. Palmer: —

> "England had been already disgraced by the writings of some

---

[1] *Have been* would have been, perhaps, more grammatical, and the same remark should be made as to the following clauses.

[2] P. 166.

unbelievers; but the works of Herbert and Bolingbroke, of Collins and Trindal, had produced little effect on the good sense and religious principles of the English nation."[1]

We deem the latter assertion of very doubtful authority. It is well known that many of the bishops and clergy themselves, whom our author praises for their able advocacy of Christianity,[2] were tainted with infidel principles. Mr. Palmer admits all this, as we have already seen; and we have likewise heard how he speaks of rationalism and infidelity in Germany and other Protestant countries.

The second proposition is no less certain. It was in England, as the associate and boon companion of Bolingbroke and other English infidels, that Voltaire conceived his impious purpose of attempting the destruction of Christianity. This is a very important fact, for which we have again Mr. Palmer's testimony: —

"After he (Voltaire) had left college, he associated only with persons of infamous morals; and having published some infidel opinions, which gave offense to the ruling powers of France, he retired to England, where he became acquainted with several unbelievers like himself. *Here he formed his resolution to destroy Christianity;* and on his return to Paris in 1730, he made no secret of his design and his hopes."[3]

Here we perceive that a noxious weed, plucked from the fertile garden of Catholic France, was carefully replanted in England, where it was nurtured to maturity; whence it was again, in an evil day, transplanted into France. Voltaire plied the very arguments, and used almost the identical language, which had been employed, with so much effect by the early reformers, for exciting popular indignation against Rome. Let us hear our author: —

"Voltaire invited men to forsake their religion, by promising them liberty of thought. He declared that 'Nothing was so contemptible and miserable in his eyes, as to see one man have recourse to another in matters of faith, or to ask what he ought to believe.' Reason, liberty and philosophy, were continually in the mouths of Voltaire and D'Alembert."[4]

It is remarkable, that when Voltaire was again under the necessity of leaving France, he found an asylum in Protestant Prussia and Switzerland. There seemed to exist a certain congenial feeling between him and the leaders of the Protestant party.

Mr. Palmer bears evidence also to the rapid spread of infidel principles among the crowned heads and the higher orders, in most Protestant countries of Europe.

"Infidelity now spread rapidly through France and through every part of the continent of Europe; several of the crowned heads were more or less favorable. The empress of Russia; the kings of Prussia, Denmark, Poland, Sweden, and *all* the princes of Germany, were either admirers of Voltaire, or avowed infidels."[5]

Our historian scarcely does justice to the Catholic clergy of France during the revolution; and he lays too much stress on the apostacy of a few among their number. Yet he cannot help avowing that—

---

[1] P. 219 [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. [4] P. 220. [5] P. 221.

> "The majority of the Roman clergy throughout Europe retained their faith, and, under the most grievous afflictions and persecutions for the name of Christ, evinced an increased measure of zeal and piety."[1]

We doubt very much, whether the Protestant clergy of the Anglican establishment would have stood the fiery ordeal half so well. We never yet heard of one of these "rich and dainty folk," who coveted the crown of martyrdom, or who was willing to die when he could avoid it; though we have read of many among them, who with remarkable liberality, were willing to bestow upon others that crown which was too thorny for their own delicate brows. During the horrors of the French revolution, hundreds and thousands of the French clergy and of religious men and women cheerfully laid down their lives for the faith, in the midst of the most excruciating tortures; but we have not yet heard of *one* Protestant clergyman, who during that whole period received the crown of martyrdom. If there was *one*, history is wholly silent on the subject. How are we to explain this singular phenomenon, but on the ground that modern infidelity is the daughter of Protestantism,—a daughter degenerate indeed, but still cherishing a tender feeling for her parent.

We have now completed our very rapid notice of Palmer's "Compendious Ecclesiastical History." As we have already intimated more than once, we have been compelled to pass over in silence many things upon which we had originally intended to animadvert. Our limits have necessarily confined us to a very brief review of the more prominent assertions of the book. We think we have said enough, however, to enable our readers to form some idea of the Oxfordite's Ecclesiastical History, as well as of the accuracy, learning, and impartiality of his Right Reverend editor and note-maker.

---

[1] P. 222.

IV. LITERATURE AND THE ARTS IN THE MIDDLE AGES.*

Importance of the subject — Writers who have treated it — Division — A Colossus falling — Incursions of the Northmen—A deluge —Beautiful Italy—Awful devastation — New dynasties — Christianity triumphant over barbarism—Civilization—Literary history—Tenth century—Gradual revival—Its causes—Golden age of Leo X.—Latin language in liturgy—And the Monastic institute — Elevation of woman — Modern languages—And Poetry—Paper—Art of Printing—Illuminated manuscripts—Universities—Schools of Law and Medicine—Musical Notes—Organs—Bells—Mariners' Compass—Geographical discoveries—Commerce—First Bank—Post-Office—Newspapers—Spectacles—Gunpowder—Stone Coal—Arithmetical Numbers—Algebra—Glass—Stained Glass—Agriculture—Botany—Clocks—Painting revived—Silk introduced—Gothic Style of Architecture—Leaning Tower of Pisa—Conclusion.

LITERATURE and the Arts during the middle ages supply a theme at once vast and important: vast, because it comprises a period of nearly one thousand years; and important, because it exhibits the rise and progress to perfection, of institutions intimately connected with civilization and political liberty. That period was the nursery of nations, the parent of civilization and of empire. From the partial chaos of those ages, sprang into existence systems of government, which, by their harmony and adaptation to the wants of mankind, are the admiration of the present century.

The attention of the literary world has been lately awakened to the importance of this subject. Italy, as usual, pioneered the way. About the middle of the last century, the learned Muratori published, in thirty huge folio volumes, the hitherto inedited works of the middle ages, to which he annexed copious and learned commentaries of his own. This herculean labor was followed by another work from the same author, in which this giant of modern literature spread out, in six large folio volumes of Essays, the results of his researches into the manners, customs, and antiquities of that period. The very vastness of this work, as well as the size of its tomes, would make one of our modern literati, who loves meager volumes with fine covers, shudder with horror! Muratori was followed by Tiraboschi, another illustrious Italian, whose classical and extensive History of Italian Literature, has, I think, no equal, and even no parallel in any other language. These works constitute a complete repertory, where the studious inquirer into the history of the middle ages may find all that he can reasonably ask for. Among the Germans who have labored to illustrate this subject, we may name Frederick and

---

* A Lecture delivered some years ago in Lexington, Ky.; and subsequently before the Catholic Institute of Baltimore and the Mechanics' Institute of Louisville, in 1851.

William Schlegel, Meiners,[1] Eichorn,[2] Heeren,[3]; and among more recent writers, Voigt and Hurter,[4] learned Protestant divines. The French have also done much in this field; it is sufficient for our purpose to name Michaud's History of the Crusades, and to allude to some learned articles in a periodical work now published in France,—and which would reflect honor on any country,—"The Annals of Christian Philosophy." Among English writers, Hallam and Maitland have, perhaps, succeeded better than any others; though their works, learned and excellent as they are in many respects, are but pigmies compared to some of those named above.

The beginning and end of the period called the Middle Ages, has been variously assigned by chronologists and historians. We prefer, as the most natural and conformable to the great outlines of history, the opinion which dates the commencement of that period from the downfall of the Roman Empire in the west in 476, and fixes its termination at the fall of the same in the east, in 1453,—a space of 977 years. The western empire, which had commenced with Augustus, terminated about 500 years afterwards in Augustulus, or the little Augustus; and the eastern, founded by Constantine the Great, when he removed the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople in 330, terminated 1123 years afterwards in Constantine Paleologus, who might also be called with some propriety Constantine the little.

That the reader may more easily follow the remarks we have to make upon this subject, we will endeavor, 1st, to trace the causes which brought about the decline of Literature in those ages: 2dly, to present a rapid historical sketch of the literary condition at various epochs of the period in question: 3dly, to point out the causes which prompted the gradual rise of letters: and 4thly, to take a general survey of the subject, and to answer the question,—how much do we owe to those ages?

I. The causes of the partial decline of letters during the period of which we are speaking, must be obvious to every reader of history. They are almost identical with those agencies, which gradually weakened, and finally overthrew the Roman empire in the west. This vast Colossus, which stood with one foot upon the heart of Europe, and the other upon Asia, grasping with one hand northern Africa and with the other the Britains, was destined to share the fate of all earthly institutions. It trembled upon its base, tottered and fell,—the victim of its own vastness, and innate tendency to decay. The German and northern hordes had ever been the most formidable enemies of Rome. The same spirit seems to have animated the Goths and Vandals under Alaric and Genseric, Attila and Totila, as had many centuries before brought Brennus with his Gauls before the walls of Rome.

While Rome continued to be the seat of empire, the efforts of the Northmen through centuries proved unavailing. As often as they attempted invasion, they were met by the Roman legions under an Adrian, a Marcus Aurelius, or a Septimius Severus, and were driven back to their northern fastnesses. But no sooner had Constantine removed the seat of government to Constantinople, than the western branch of the empire was devoted to destruction. Franks, Goths, Vandals, Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Alans, Huns, Lombards, Danes, and Normans, successively swept like torrents over the most beautiful provinces of Europe. Nothing could resist their force, or check their headlong career. They carried everything before them. They conquered but to destroy. They demolished almost everything; for more than two centuries they built up nothing.

---

[1] Vergleichung der sitten, etc.. des mittelalters mit denen unsers Jahrhunderts.
[2] Allgemeine Geschichte der Cultur und Literatur.
[3] Geschichte des studium der Classischen Literatur
[4] Since become a Catholic.

From the year 400 to the year 600, was a sad period for Europe. The first conquerors did not occupy the soil which they had subdued; they pushed on to new conquests, or rather to new devastations. The territory they had last left was immediately invaded by another tribe more rapacious than themselves; and thus pushing each other on, as wave driving wave, they covered the face of Europe with the waters of a deluge of barbarism for centuries. It was only after the apparently inexhaustible population of the North had been almost drained, that the different tribes began to settle down permanently on the soil which they had hitherto only occasionally occupied.

Italy suffered most, as she was the favorite land with the Northmen; she was always aimed at because always beautiful,[1] as an Italian orator lately said; there was scarcely a tribe, which did not trample down her lovely fields and rich vineyards. During the brief space of twenty years, Rome was taken by assault and pillaged five times! Yet a late American writer has well said: —

> "There was, in that period of general social dissolution one country, in which the work of devastation commenced much later, and ended much sooner. Italy in the middle ages was like Mt. Ararat in the Deluge, — the last reached by the flood and the first left. The remains of the Roman social world were either never utterly dispersed in that country, or far later than any where else; and if we are to date the close of the middle ages from the extinction of feudalism, that revolution was effected in Italy, no less than three centuries before the time of Charles V. — the epoch assumed by Hallam, as the conclusion of his work. It would then, perhaps, be expedient to refer the history of Europe in the middle ages to Italy, as the history of the ancient world has always been referred to Rome. The great ascendency of the papal power, and the influence of Italian genius on the literature and the fine arts of all countries, made Italy essentially the center of light — the sovereign of thought — the Capital of Civilization!"[2]

The justice of this tribute to Italy is confirmed by Hallam, who says:

"It may be said with some truth, that Italy supplied the fire from which other nations in this first, as afterwards in the second era of the revival of letters, lighted their own torches. Lanfranc, Anselm, Peter Lombard, the founder of systematic theology in the twelfth century, Irnerius, the restorer of jurisprudence, Gratian, the author of the first compilation of canon law, the school of Salerno, that guided medical art in all countries, the first dictionaries of the Latin tongue, the first treatise of Algebra, the first great work that makes an epoch in Anatomy, are as truly and exclusively the boast of Italy, as the restoration of Greek literature and of classical taste in the fifteenth century."[1]

---

[1] "Sempre bersagliata, perche sempre bella."
[2] North American Review, 1840 — Art. Hallam's Middle Ages.

The Northmen not only arrested agriculture and pillaged cities, but they often destroyed libraries, and tore or defaced the finest monuments of Literature and the Arts. They spared nothing in their ruthless career of destruction. Occasionally, indeed, an Attila, calling himself *"the Scourge of God,"* would pause with awe before a Leo the Great pleading with a divine energy, that his flock might be spared by the wolf; and even a Totila, the last ravager of Rome, (A. D. 554) would quail before the humble sanctity of a Benedict; but these are only exceptions to a general rule. Even the monasteries, those sanctuaries of learning, though often spared, were sometimes pillaged and destroyed. The famous monastery of Mt. Cassino, in Italy, to which even Totila had made a pilgrimage of reverence, was afterwards plundered by the Lombards, (A. D. 580).

The confusion of society, — the perpetual tumults which distracted Europe, the destruction of agriculture and manufactures, and the misery and wretchedness thereby induced, — the tears and cries of the widow and orphan, — and the other evils of that period, are feelingly deplored by cotemporaneous writers. So great was the distress in Europe, that about the beginning of the tenth century, many believed the end of the world was at hand.

These causes seemed to act with but little intermission, until towards the end of the tenth century, or during a period of nearly 500 years. It required this long period to enable Europe to settle down, and to become adapted to the new order of things, brought about by a series of revolutions till then unparalleled in history.

In the midst of continual agitation and revolution, men could not find time to apply to the cultivation of letters. From necessity, their hands were better trained to the use of the sword than to that of the pen. From the continual devastation of wars, books, which could then be multiplied only by the copyist, became exceedingly scarce. The venerable Alexandrian library was destroyed by the Saracens in 641, and its fate was unhappily shared by many other valuable libraries in Europe. Books were so dear that they could be procured only by the wealthy, precisely because they had become so scarce. A memorable instance of this occurs in the case of the Dutchess of Anjou, who for one copy of a book of Homilies, gave one hundred sheep and eighty bushels of wheat. The loan of books itself, became sometimes a matter of diplomatic negotiation.

---

[1] Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries; 2 vols. 8vo; — Harper's Edition, vol. 1. p. 58.

Another fact must be kept in view. Not only did new dynasties arise on the ruins of previous institutions, but a new race peopled Europe, with new manners, customs, laws, and religion; whilst the miserable remnant of the original population was reduced to a degrading vassalage. Who can wonder, if under these circumstances, literature declined? The great marvel is, that it was not entirely and forever prostrated. And but for the finger of God, acting through the divinely reactive energies of Catholic Christianity, we sincerely believe that this would have been the case.

Christianity was trampled in the dust by the armies of the infidel or semi-infidel[1] Northmen, but her divine spirit was not subdued. She conquered like her Founder, by being seemingly conquered for a time, by death! She bent her heavenly form to the tempest, but did not quail under its violence; and when its utmost fury had been spent, she raised her head, and exhibited her divine countenance and heavenly features to the barbarians who held her captive;—they paused, and,—

"God! how they admired her heavenly hue."[2]

They were stricken with awe, they reverently took off her chains, fell down before her, worshiped at her shrine, and swore eternal fidelity to her cause! Their enthusiasm was turned into another and better channel; and the subsequent history of Chivalry and the Crusades contains the record of its mighty results.

After having subdued her conquerors by converting them, Christianity had to tame their ferocity, and gradually to civilize and enlighten them. And nobly did she accomplish these results. But she determined wisely to proceed gradually and slowly in the great work. She knew that all great beneficial changes, which are intended to affect whole masses, are slow and gradual in their operation, and that nothing which is violent is permanent. The sturdy oak, which has vanquished a thousand storms, has been for centuries acquiring its present firmness and solidity; while the earthquake and the tornado are the work of a moment.

A striking confirmation of this principle is exhibited in the literary history of the Middle Ages. Letters continued to decline for nearly five hundred years, until they reached their lowest stage in the tenth century; and then they gradually improved for about the same period, until they arrived at their highest point, or zenith, in the golden age of Leo X., about the beginning of the sixteenth century.[3] And this naturally leads us to the second point of our division, in which we will endeavor to give a rapid historical sketch of the various epochs of literature during the period in question.

---

[1] Some of the Northmen had been partially imbued with the Arian heresy.

[2] Dryden's Hind and Panther.

[3] Hallam thinks that "the seventh century is the nadir of the human mind in Europe," though he admits that in England the darkness was greatest in the tenth.—Introduction, &c., sup. cit. I, 26.

II. In the fall of Rome, and the establishment of the Gothic kingdom in Italy under Odoacer, in 476, Literature received a heavy blow. Yet amidst the turmoil of war, and the storm of revolution, many were found in different parts of the fallen empire who devoted their time to letters.

In the sixth century, Vigilius Tapsensis wrote and published in Africa many works of considerable merit. Dionysius Exiguus, or the Little, became famous by inventing the Pashal Cycle, and settling the Christian era, about the year 516; and though his chronology has been thought to be slightly erroneous, yet it has been followed by all Christendom ever since his time. He was alike distinguished as an astronomer, historian, and theologian, and he would have reflected honor on any age. In the same century, Gregory of Tours wrote his History of the Franks, which is the foundation of all early French history. Italy was rendered conspicuous in the same age by two names, illustrious in philosophy and polite learning: Cassiodorus and Boethius, both of noble family and senatorial rank, but more illustrious far by their piety and devotion to letters. The former writing to the latter, praises him for having re-established Greek learning in Italy, and for having translated, for the benefit of his countrymen, the works of Pythagoras, Ptolemy, Euclid, Plato, Aristotle, and Archimedes.

About the middle of the seventh century (A. D. 669), Greek literature was introduced into England by Theodorus, the seventh archbishop of Canterbury, himself a Greek. St. Gregory the Great, by his virtues, enlightened mind, and patronage of learning, shone like a bright luminary in the center of Italy about the beginning of this century; while St. Isidore of Seville, by valuable works on almost every subject, laid open the treasures of learning to his countrymen in Spain. The compendious and encyclopedical character of his writings, was well adapted to an age, in which books were scarce, and could not be obtained without great difficulty. Towards the close of this century flourished the venerable Bede, the father of English history, whose name is in itself a sufficient eulogy. Beside his famous history, he wrote several works on Grammar, Music, Arithmetic, and other branches. The monastery of Lindisfarne became, under him, a radiating point of literature to all Europe.

St. John of Damascus, who is considered by some as the reviver of the dialectic or Aristotelian method of reasoning, flourished in the eighth century. In the same age Paul, the Deacon, wrote his valuable history of the Lombards, and Paulinus of Aquileia published several Latin poems of respectable merit. The close of this century is famed for a praiseworthy effort made by the emperor Charlemagne to stay the downward tendency of letters, and to infuse a new literary energy into Europe. Who has not heard of Alcuin, the learned English monk, employed by that great prince to carry into effect his intentions; of Peter the Deacon, of Pisa, his preceptor; of Eginhard, his secretary and historian; and of many others whom this munificent patron of letters attracted to his court? He established in his palace regular conferences on literary subjects among the literati whom he gathered around him, and thereby laid the foundation of those academies and literary associations, which have subsequently done so much for the advancement of learning. Before the reign of Charlemagne, schools had been established in many of the monasteries and parishes in Italy, France, England, Ireland, Spain, and Germany; and he ordered by a public law, that seminaries of learning should be opened at every cathedral church throughout his vast empire.

Towards the close of the following century, a similar effort was made by Alfred the Great, of England, to re-establish learning in his kingdom. He was one of the most extraordinary men that ever lived. He fought fifty-four pitched battles with various vicissitudes of fortune, and yet, whether in the camp or in his palace, he invariably devoted one-third of his time to prayer and study. He made a law, that every man who owned two hides of land should send his children to school until they were sixteen years of age, and that his sheriffs and officers should apply to letters, or quit their offices. He translated many works into his vernacular language, and wrote several poems.[1]

It was the fate of the great men just named, to have their benevolent intentions in a great measure frustrated, by the imbecility and domestic feuds of their children and successors, and by the rude and evil nature of the times.

The tenth century is generally reputed the darkest of all the Middle Ages. It was natural that it should be so. The causes which brought about the decline of letters had been steadily operating for nearly five hundred years; and during this century unhappy Europe, already scourged for long ages, and bleeding at every pore, was invaded in the north by the Danes, in the center by the Normans, and in the south by the Saracens. Yet even in this iron age there were many illustrious men: Otho the Great, of Germany, whose praises were celebrated in a Latin epic poem of some merit, still extant, by Roswida, a cotemporary Saxon poetess; Ratherius and Luitprand of Italy, the latter of whom was a writer of considerable spirit and much wit, though his style is infected with much of the grossness of the age. Even during this century, the monks kept up their constant occupation of copying books; as is proved by the fact, that when the Saracens took and pillaged a monastery, near Novara in the north of Italy, they found, among the works in its library, copies of Virgil, Horace, and Cicero. The Poles, Hungarians, and a portion of the Russians, were also converted to Christianity during this century.

Hallam does not subscribe to the more generally received opinion, that the tenth was the least enlightened of the Middle Ages, at least so far as France and Germany are concerned. He says:

---

[1] See Burke's Works, vol. ii. Abridgment of English History.

"But, compared with the seventh and eighth century, the tenth was an age of illumination in France. And Meiners, who judged the Middle Ages somewhat perhaps too severely, but with a penetrating and comprehensive observation, of which there had been few instances, had gone so far as to say, that 'in no age, perhaps, did Germany possess more learned and virtuous Churchmen of the episcopal order, than in the latter half of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh century.' Eichorn points out indications of a more extensive acquaintance with ancient writers in several French and German ecclesiastics of this period."[1]

III. From the beginning of the eleventh century, the prospects of Literature began to brighten. That and the following centuries could boast the names of Gerbert, Anselm, Lanfranc, St. Bernard, Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, Roger Bacon, Scotus, and St. Thomas Aquinas. The last name alone would immortalize any age or country. How subtle and well balanced the mind, how deep the research, how accurate the reasoning of Aquinas! In strength, depth, grasp, and clearness of mind, he was the equal, in many other respects he was the superior, of Lord Bacon and Sir Isaac Newton, the much vaunted giants of English scientific literature.

The causes which brought about this favorable change in the literary condition of Europe are obvious. When, as above stated, she had been reduced to the lowest point of misery, a reaction was naturally expected. A practice, which obtained very extensively during that period, contributed much to bring about this reaction. Christians were in the habit of making pilgrimages to Rome and Jerusalem, to renew on the spots were they occurred a remembrance of the sufferings and triumphs of the apostles, martyrs, and of the Great King of Martyrs. This custom afforded the double advantage of causing men to visit or pass through places where literature was still cultivated, and of bringing them into more frequent contact with each other.[2] Whatever brings the masses of mankind into continual intercourse, tends to elicit talent, to stimulate inquiry, and to promote learning. The law of physical nature,—that inactivity produces disease, stagnation, or death, and that motion promotes health, vigor, and life,—is true also of the moral and literary condition of mankind.

The pilgrimages paved the way for a series of great and mighty events, which aroused Europe from her lethargy, united all her jarring elements, and concentrated her energies on one great object. The Crusades did more than this. They broke down the feudal system, enlarged the boundaries of dynasties, and drained Europe of most of those fiery spirits, who were conspicuous for nothing but stirring up civil feuds, or causing open wars. They originated a spirit of enterprise, stimulated commerce, threw men on their own resources, and taught them how to make those resources available. The old adage that "necessity is the mother of invention,"—was never more fully verified, as we shall see in a subsequent part of this Lecture. In a political point of view, the Crusades were equally advantageous. They were a decisive blow in the great struggle which continued for centuries, between barbarism and civilization, between Asia and Europe, between the Crescent and the Cross! When the heroes who fought under Godfrey de Bouillon planted their glorious banner on the battlements of Jerusalem, in 1099, and made it float there triumphantly for nearly one hundred years, they planted a thorn in the side of Islamism, that did more perhaps than any thing else, to cripple that warlike monster, which was marching with giant strides, cimetar in hand, over the world, blighting and destroying every thing in its course. The fall of Constantinople was thus retarded perhaps for centuries, and while the Mussulmans were engaged at home with the invaders of their own territory, the Christians of Europe had time to repose, and to prepare for the still coming struggle.

---

[1] Introduction to Literature, etc., i, 28.

[2] See Burke's works, ibid, ch. 2, v. 2. p. 514. et seq.

That master stroke of policy,—that "carrying of the war into Africa,"—will reflect immortal honor on the political wisdom and searching forecast of Gregory VII. and Urban II., who planned and carried into execution those expeditions.[1]

The invention of the art of printing, by Guttenberg and Faust, in 1436;—the munificent patronage of letters by the houses of Medici, of Este, and of Gonzaga, and by the Popes in Italy;—the vast number of learned Greeks who fled to Europe on the taking of Constantinople by Mohammed II. in 1453, and the welcome which these men received, especially in Italy,—completed what the Crusades had begun. Literature progressed with giant strides in Italy, which had shone as a beacon light to the rest of Europe throughout the long period of the Middle Ages, and towards its close blazed up so brilliantly, as to excite the surprise, and to dazzle the eyes of mankind. There was a galaxy of genius in the golden age of Leo X., in the beginning of the sixteenth century,—very properly styled the second Augustan Age of Roman literature.

> But see each Muse in Leo's golden days
> Starts from her trance, and trims her withered bays;
> Rome's ancient genius o'er its ruins spread,
> Shakes off the dust, and rears his rev'rend head.
> Then sculpture and her sister arts revive,
> Stones leaped to form, and rocks began to live.
> With sweeter notes each rising temple rung;
> A Raphael painted, and a Vida sung.
> Immortal Vida! on thy honored brow,
> The poet's bays and critic's ivy grow;
> Cremona now shall ever boast thy name,
> As next in place to Mantua, next in fame!

---

[1] That this motive was combined with the enthusiastic desire to recover the holy land, desecrated by the Mussulmans, is manifest from the Acts of the Council of Clermont in 1095, and from the speech of Urban II., in this council, which is a master piece of eloquence and political wisdom.

IV. Were the middle ages as *dark* as they are usually represented by Protestant historians? How much do we owe to that period? I might rather ask, what is there in Literature and the Arts that we do *not* owe to those ages? We owe to them the ancient Grecian and Roman Literature, which but for the care and indefatigable industry of men who deserve every praise, and who receive nought but sneers, would have been utterly and irretrievably lost, amidst the storms and revolutions which swept over Europe during the greater part of that period.

Two institutions of the Catholic religion greatly contributed to this happy result: the preservation of the Latin language in the public service, and the monastic orders. The former imposed upon all candidates for orders the obligation of learning the Latin language and of studying the ancient Roman literature, and thereby afforded them a powerful inducement to preserve the master-pieces of Roman composition;[1] while the latter opened sacred retreats and holy sanctuaries for learning, while the rude storm of war was sweeping over the world, destroying in mankind all relish for letters, and desolating the proudest monuments of Literature and the Arts.[2] The monasteries were generally situated in remote solitudes, or amidst mountain rocks and torrents; they offered little inducement to the plunderer, besides being almost inaccessible to his clans. It was one of the stated rules of the monks of St. Benedict, to devote a portion of their time to study and to copying books, and in the quietness of their cells, by their untiring industry, they preserved and transmitted to us the precious treasures of ancient classic Literature. Enlightened men of every religious creed have done justice to the monks. And yet it is the fashion at the present day to sneer at these deserving men, in season and out of season; and every valiant knight, who, booted and spurred, mounts his fiery Rosinante, and dashes in among the hooded monks of the dark ages, scattering them hither and yon, as he of La Mancha did the flock of sheep, thinks that he has achieved a brilliant exploit!

We have now before us a list of TWENTY-FIVE great improvements and inventions, which we owe to those much abused ages, many of them of vast and paramount importance to society.

1st. At the head of the list deserves to be placed, on account of its great influence on modern refinement, the elevation of female character, for which we are mainly indebted to the chivalry of the Middle Ages. When the Northmen were converted to the Catholic faith in the fifth and the following centuries, they learned, along with other teachings of Christianity, that the Saviour God whom they adored vouchsafed to be born of a woman, to call her *Mother*, and to be subject to Her. The high honor thus divinely conferred upon MARY, was reflected from her upon her whole sex; just as the disobedience and consequent dishonor of Eve had bowed down woman to the dust, marked by the serpent's trail. The generous Northmen caught up at once this idea, so just and so beautiful, and their enthusiasm in honor of the sex was aroused. The principles of medieval chivalry were developed; but the feeling outstripped the principle, and woman suddenly found herself raised as much above her true level in society, as she had hitherto been degraded below it. The humble daughter of Mary was thus far exalted above the proud daughter of Eve. But the extravagant excesses of chivalrous devotion to the sex were curbed by the holy principles of religion; and the result of these elements and causes, is the station which woman now occupies in society. Under Paganism she was the slave or toy of man; the creature of his caprice, or the victim of his tyranny. Even the more polished society of ancient Greece and Rome afforded but very imperfect exceptions to this remark. Thanks to Christianity and to the Middle Ages, she has ceased to be the slave, and has been made the companion of man: from being the drudge of society, she has become its ornament and refiner.

---

[1] See Burke's works, vol. 2, Abridgment of Eng. History, c. 2, p. 514 et seq.

[2] Burke, ibid.

The restoration of woman to her proper station in society had a powerful influence on civilization and Literature. Even the extravagancies of chivalry had their beneficial results. Female influence not only prompted to deeds of valor, but also stimulated men to triumphs in poetry and Literature; the delicate hands of woman wove not only the chaplet which decorated the warrior's brow, but also the laurel and the ivy wreath, which adorned the brow of genius.

Women did more at that period than exert a mere influence; they acted their own parts. Who has not heard of the famous Joan of Arc, the maid of Orleans, who at the tender age of seventeen, led the disheartened troops of France to deeds of heroic valor, retrieving the fortunes of her country conquered by a foreign foe; driving the English from more than half of France, and finishing her mission by crowning Charles VII. King of France, at Rheims, which but a few months previously was in the very heart of the territory conquered by the enemy? Nor are her laurels stained by the fact, that when taken by her enemies, she was, at the instigation of the Duke of Bedford, condemned and inhumanly burned as a sorceress and witch![1] Who has not heard of Queen Margaret of Sweden, the Semiramis of the north, who in the thirteenth century, by her political prowess, united all the jarring elements of northern Scandinavia into one vast kingdom? Or of Anna Comnena, the authoress of the famous Alexiad, in the twelfth century? Or of more than one lady who during that period taught philosophy and belles lettres in the University at Bologna[2]—not to mention Heloise, skilled in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew learning, upon whose story many moderns have raised so man extravagant and ridiculous fictions?

---

[1] Twenty years afterwards, in 1451, Pope Calixtus III., had her sentence revoked, and pronounced her a patriot and martyr.

[2] The most famous of these femmes savantes, were Modesta di Pozzo, Cassandra Fidele, Isabella di Cordova, Isabella de Roseres, Catharine Ribera, and Aloysia Sigea.—[See Robelot, Influence de la Reformat. p. 339.]

2. We owe all our Modern Languages to the Middle Ages: the Italian, with its sweetness; the French, with all its grace and delicacy; the Spanish, with its stern dignity; the German and English with all their force and richness. The Italian may be considered as the first daughter of the Latin, the most soft and comely; the French as the second daughter, less fair than her elder sister, but possessed of more tact and more varied graces; and the Spanish, not as the *daughter*, but as the *son*, of the Latin, with the stern features and manly voice of the parent. It is a matter of surprise, how languages so beautiful and perfect could have sprung from amidst the constant turmoil and confusion of those ages; and especially, how the Italian, so sweet and musical, could have resulted from the union of the Latin, itself not remarkable for sweetness, with the harsher sounds of the North. We are forcibly reminded of a fable in heathen mythology:—as the Cytherean Venus, the *beau ideal* of ancient perfection in beauty, was fabled to have sprung from the froth of the sea; so the Italian, the softest and most beautiful of modern languages, may be said to have sprung, in all its symmetry and beauty of form, from the froth of a sea agitated by continued storms and revolutions.

Whatever theory we may adopt on the question, whether language be a divine gift, or merely a human invention, or a result of both agencies combined, there can be no doubt as to the merit which attaches to its full development and cultivation. A rich, strong, precise, or melodious language indicates corresponding qualities in the people who employ it as a medium of thought; and we know of no instance in which a fully developed and highly cultivated language does not betoken a refined literary taste.

3. We owe all our Modern Poetry, and also the introduction of rythm into poetry, to those ages. Italy, as usual, led the way. The rude laws of the Troubadours, in the twelfth, prepared the world for the *Divina Commedia* of Dante, in the thirteenth century. His effusions were followed by the noble strains of Petrarch, who was crowned with laurel at Rome in the fourteenth century. The English poet Chaucer was the friend, but by no means the equal of Petrarch; his taste was often vitiated by too great attachment to the rhymes of the Troubadours, and he imitated too servilely his great Italian cotemporary.

4. The Paper upon which we write was invented in the Middle Ages. From ancient MSS. it appears that cotton paper was used in Italy as early as the tenth century, while linen paper seems to have been introduced in the fourteenth.[1] We now reap the fruits of an invention, which has made the material upon which we write and print so cheap, as to be accessible to all. Before the invention of paper, parchment, and papyrus, the latter an article manufactured from a plant in Egypt, were chiefly used; but they were both rare and expensive. When the Saracens over-

---

[1] This date for the invention of linen paper is assigned by Tiraboschi. Hallam fixes it earlier,—in 1100.—Introduction, &c, I. 60, supra cit.

ran Egypt, in 641, the importation of papyrus into Europe seems to have ceased; and, to the inventive genius of the Italians, thus thrown on their own resources, we owe the present material, superior to it in every respect.

5. The glory of having invented the Art of Printing, also belongs to the period of which we are speaking. I allude not only to the Art as invented by Guttenberg or Faust, in 1436, at Strasburg and Mentz, but also to an invention of a much earlier date, which was only extended and improved by the persons above named. I mean the invention of *Chirotypography*, or printing by hand, of which undoubted traces are found in many ancient diplomas, as old as the tenth century, and in some illuminated works of equal antiquity, hitherto viewed as manuscripts. A learned Italian, the Abbate Requeno, in a work published a few years since at Rome, has amply established this fact; of which, however, I have been unable to find mention in any work of standard English literature: —and yet it is fashionable for our standard writers to sneer at the ignorance of the Italians, though to them Literature certainly owes more than to any other nation. Requeno proves that two kinds of hand printing were in use, —the impression was sometimes taken by plates with letters carved on them, sometimes by moveable types of wood, or ivory, or metal. Only one step was wanting to render this invention valuable, and to multiply copies, —*the Press;* and Guttenberg made this step. It should be recollected, however, that it is easy to add to inventions already made: *facile est inventis addere.* It is a remarkable fact, in both stages of the history of this invention, that the first mode adopted was that which afterwards constituted the highest perfection in the art: viz., the use of stereotype plates, which Guttenberg abandoned in favor of moveable types, because he knew of no way of casting the former, to render them available.

6. The Illuminated Manuscripts of the Middle Ages show that the art of penmanship was then carried to a degree of perfection, which it has never since attained. Who that has seen those manuscripts, has not admired their splendid pictorial illustrations, their taste and exquisite beauty! The use of gold and silver ink, seems also to have been common at that period; and in the Vatican library, at Rome, there is preserved a splendid illuminated manuscript copy of the New Testament in Greek, as old as the eleventh century, and written entirely in letters of gold! I doubt whether our modern artists could produce any thing equal, or even similar to this splendid specimen of art.

7. Universities were first founded in those ages. To them we owe the two great English Universities; Oxford, founded in 886 by Alfred the Great, and Cambridge in 915;[1] the famous University of Paris, said to have been first established by Charlemagne, about the year 800;[2] —and

---

[1] Some writers believe that the schools founded by Alfred did not become universities until some time in the twelfth century. See Hallam — Introduction to the Literature of Europe, &c., vol. 1, p 82.

[2] The same remark may be made in regard to this famous school, which, though claimed to have been founded by Charlemagne, did not probably acquire a charter of rights as a university, until about two centuries later. See Hallam, *ibid.* p. 80.

the perfect galaxy of Italian Universities, at Rome, Bologna, Padua, Pavia, and Pisa, which became famous in the twelfth and following centuries, and which counted their students not by hundreds, but by thousands. The University of Padua, the *alma mater* of Christopher Columbus and Americus Vespuccius, is said to have contained, at one time no less than 18,000 students. The University of Oxford contained, in the thirteenth century, according to the testimony of its historian Anthony Wood, a Protestant, no less than 30,000 students.[1]

The Pandects of Justinian were discovered in the eleventh century: and the study of the civil and canon law was shortly after revived by the famous Irnerius or Werner, in the University of Bologna. Youths from all parts of Europe frequented this and the other Italian Universities, and returned to their native countries, to diffuse among their countrymen the stores of knowledge they had thus accumulated. Italy thus became the radiating point of Literature to all Europe, and her Universities contributed, perhaps as much as any other cause, to the revival of learning and to the march of civilization. The University of Paris deserves great praise for having contributed its full portion to the good work. Medical schools were also established at Salerno, in the south of Italy, in the eleventh century, (some say the seventh), and at Montpelier and Paris, in the twelfth; and thus the science of medicine was revived. In all these improvements, the monks acted a very conspicuous part.

In concluding this subject, I will remark, that of the two English Universities, Oxford has five halls and twenty colleges, and that *all her halls*, and twelve of her Colleges, were founded and endowed before the year 1516! Cambridge has seventeen colleges, of which twelve were founded before 1511;—from which fact it would appear that, notwithstanding all our boasting, the *dark* ages have done more for Literature than a more *enlightened* period!

8. Who is so dull of ear, as not to be delighted with the harmony of musical sound? We owe to the *dark* ages, an invention unknown to the ancients, by which Music has become a science, taught upon regular principles. Guido of Arezzo, an Italian monk, by inventing the notes of the *gamut*, in 1124, did for Music, what the inventor of alphabets did for language,— reduced sounds to simple and systematic rules. He also invented many musical instruments, such as the cymbal and heptachord. While on this subject, we may remark, that Organs were either invented in Italy, or at least introduced into Europe by the Italians, in the eighth century; and that the use of Bells in churches may be dated back to the year 605 of the Christian era.

9. But we are indebted to those abused ages, for another invention, which has perhaps had as great an influence as any other in advancing the cause of civilization, and extending the boundaries of human knowledge. And it is in consequence of this invention that we tread the soil of this vast continent, which but for it, would never probably have been

---

[1] *Athenæ Oxonienses.*

discovered by the civilized world. We mean the Mariner's Compass. The precise date of this invention is not known; but it is spoken of by French and Italian writers in the twelfth century. The Amalfites, enterprising mariners in the south of Italy, seem to have been the first to apply it to navigation.

The invention at its first stage was rude and simple enough. The magnetized needle was placed in a vessel of water, upon pieces of straw or two split sticks; and it was evidently of little use when a vessel was agitated by a rough sea. About the close of the thirteenth century, *Flavio di Gioja,* an Italian of Pasitano, a village near Amalfi, devised a method by which this inconvenience was obviated: he suspended the needle on a pivot placed at its center, and it thus became available under all circumstances. The box, with the points of the Compass marked on its rim, was added, and thus the invention was completed, though it was subsequently much improved. The *fleur de lis* is said to have been placed at the North Pole, in honor of the royal house of France, which then controlled the government of Naples, whose subject *di Gioja* was.

The ancients knew something of the loadstone, but never thought of applying it to navigation. Some writers, whose spirit leads them to detract as much as possible from Christian nations, and to give the merit of every thing to Pagans, have contended that the Chinese invented the Mariner's Compass. It is, however, certain, from the letters of the earliest missionaries to China, that the species of compass formerly used by the Chinese was entirely different from our magnetic needle. And if we consider the truly wonderful progress which this *very enlightened* people have since made in navigation, with their beautiful junks, as broad as they are long, plowing the deep, we will certainly feel disposed to award them every honor and glory; especially as they make themselves some thousands of years older than the world!

10. The invention just mentioned led to other great improvements. The frequent and extensive voyages undertaken by Italian navigators, greatly increased the amount of geographical knowledge. The travels of Rubruquis, and Marco Polo, the famous Venetian navigator, as well as the written account of the Catholic missionaries, who, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, penetrated into the very heart of Asia, threw additional light upon the history, manners and customs, and geography of those distant nations. From the ancient map made by Marco Polo, and recently published, with learned essays, by the late Cardinal Zurla, it appears manifest that Polo doubled the Cape of Good Hope, and visited Madagascar. The Canary Islands were also discovered by the Portuguese, in the thirteenth century. Thus was the way prepared for the discovery of America by Columbus, in 1492.

11. Commerce was also carried on with spirit and vigor from about the same time, and the products of the whole world flowed into Europe. Italy here also led the way. The Venetian, Genoese, and Pisan republics, carried on an extensive trade with Asia and Egypt. The Venetians,

from the year 1096, the era of the first crusade, became the carriers of Europe. Another powerful commercial league sprang up in the thirteenth century, in the north-western part of Europe. The Hanseatic league, which began in 1241, with the two cities of Hamburg and Lubeck, comprised in 1370 no less than sixty-four cities and forty-four allies.

12. The first Bank was founded at Venice in the year 1157. To facilitate commercial intercourse, bills of exchange (lettere di cambio) were also introduced into Italy about the same time.

13. The increased intercourse among mankind for commercial purposes, and the necessity of carrying on regular correspondence with distant persons, suggested the idea of a Post-Office. We read that the University of Paris, and the Italian Universities, as early as the twelfth century, established regular *couriers* through all parts of Europe, for the purpose of enabling the students to correspond with their parents, and to collect money to pay their expenses. Such was the humble commencement of an institution; which has since been so far extended and perfected, as to ramify throughout the whole world, and to furnish a regular medium of intercourse for the most distant nations. We may here remark, *en passant*, that the first Newspapers were published in Venice, in 1562.

14. We also owe to the period of which we are speaking, an invention which enables old persons to read, and prevents those who are afflicted with shortsightedness from falling into many disasters, which would otherwise beset this afflicted class of human beings. Spectacles for the old and shortsighted were first constructed by Salvino, a monk of Pisa, in Italy, in 1285. Some writers award the merit of this invention to the famous English monk, Roger Bacon. It is, however, probable, that he never constructed spectacles; though in his *Opus Majus* he certainly explains the principle upon which they should be made. He also unfolds the principle of the telescope, microscope, and magic lantern; and he speaks of a certain inextinguishable fire, which is generally understood to mean phosphorus. In the same work he speaks of a certain composition of saltpetre, sulphur, and charcoal, which would imitate the sound and brilliancy of thunder and lightning, and one square inch of which ignited would destroy a whole army or city. Hence some have considered him the inventor of

15. Gunpowder, of which he certainly had a clear idea. It is however probable that his knowledge was confined to theory and a few experiments.[1] Schwartz, a monk of Cologne, seems to have been the first who manufactured gunpowder, about the year 1320. Cannons were used in the battles of Crecy and Poictiers, towards the close of the fourteenth century. If the Chinese historians deserve any credit, the celestial empire had the merit of inventing gunpowder, long before this world was made! As early as the year 688, a composition, called the

[1] He died in 1292.

Greek fire, was employed by the orientals, especially in sea fights : but all agree that it was not *our* gunpowder. A work is still preserved in the University of Oxford, England, written in the ninth century by one Gracchus, who describes a compound nearly resembling that of which we are treating.

No invention has perhaps exerted a more powerful, and I believe a more beneficial influence on the destinies of the world, than that of this terrific agent. It has entirely changed the aspect of war. It has affected fortification, ship building, and has wholly changed military tactics. Besides its beneficial influence on internal improvements, it has, strange to say, softened and mitigated the horrors of war, and greatly diminished the number of those who fall in battle. Armies formerly engaged in mortal combat face to face, and fought for whole days, often returning to the combat, nor was victory obtained until one or the other army was nearly annihilated; men now fight at a distance, and the contest is soon decided. Thousands fell formerly, where hundreds fall now. Compare any great ancient battle with any decisive modern engagement, and you will be convinced of the truth of this remark. Take for example two of the most decisive engagements recorded in history : the battle of Waterloo, and that between Poictiers and Tours in 732, when Charles Martel defeated the Saracens. In the former, the total amount of killed and wounded on both sides was about 56,000, of whom perhaps not half were killed ; whereas in the latter the Saracens alone had 100,000 — some say 300,000 killed.

16. Stone Coal, which has since proved so extensively useful, in private residences and in manufactories, was discovered in England in 1307.

17. The Arabian arithmetical Numbers were introduced into Europe by the famous Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester II., about the year 991. Thus the foundation of arithmetic was laid, and the science of mathematics began from this time to be extensively studied. Algebraic calculation was also introduced into Europe by the Italians, in 1412.[1]

18. Though the ancient Greeks and Romans were acquainted with Glass, yet they seem never to have used it in windows. This improvement in the comforts of life, was generally adopted in Europe in the Middle Ages. The first mention of glass windows occurs in writers of the third and fourth century.

19. A method of staining glass was generally known and employed during that period, which has since been lost. Efforts were made during the last century in Germany and France to revive this beautiful art, but with very imperfect success. The solemn and mellow light of the old Gothic churches, which tends to inspire us with pensive, yet pleasing emotions, is owing to the use in them of stained glass.

[1] The Arabians have the credit of these inventions. They also excelled in medicine. They learned much from the works of the ancient Greek authors, whom this active and enterprising people translated. This is about all that can be said in favor of the literature of the fanatical followers of Mohammed, at least in its relation to the European literature of the Middle Ages. Yet some authors would wish to convey the impression that what we do not owe to the Chinese, we have derived from the Arabs!

20. The chief sufferings of Europe during the Middle Ages grew out of the neglect of Agriculture. The monks applied themselves early to this useful art, and taught others how to practice it. The monasteries were generally situated in remote and desert places; the monks reclaimed the soil, drained the marshes, fertilized even the rocky mountain tops, and improved whole districts. They also taught the people other useful arts. Thus, when the people of Sussex in England were perishing with hunger during a famine, in 605, Bishop Wilfrid at the head of his monks, plunged into the sea in presence of the assembled multitudes, and thus opened to them a new source of subsistence, of which their ignorance or druidical superstitions had hitherto deprived them.[1]

21. The monks also cultivated Botany, and studied the medical qualities of plants. The clergy were in many places the only physicians. It is a remarkable feature in that age, that every pursuit was referred to, or connected with, religion. The names of flowers were taken from some supposed aptitude to recall religious reminiscences. The passion-flower, the marygold, and others are examples of this. How beautiful and poetical the turn of thought, which suggested the idea of the Floral Calendar, by which the plants, in their different times of flowering, marked the division of time, and pointed to the holy festivals of religion! This was truly giving to the flowers a *language*, which spoke of God and his saints — of religion — of Heaven!

"What a lovely thought to mark the hours,
As they floated in light away;
By the opening and the folding flowers,
That laugh unto the summer's day!"

22. The Clock was invented in the Middle Ages. The invention is prior to the twelfth century, though the author of it is not clearly known. The phrase, "the clock has struck," was common in the twelfth century. Some award the honor of the invention to the famous Gerbert, already mentioned, who certainly put up a clock for Otho the Great, at Magdeburg, about the year 1000. Others ascribe it to the Italian monk Pacificus, and others to the Abbott William, of Hirschau in Germany. It is probable that they all contributed their share to the invention, at nearly about the same time. It is a remarkable fact in the history of human knowledge, that in its progress many learned men in different places hit simultaneously upon the same invention. Every scholar has heard of the controversies between the friends of Gallileo and Huygens about the application of the *pendulum* to clocks; between Newton and Hook and the Bernouillies, about the first discoverer of the laws of attraction; and between Newton and Leibnitz about the authorship of the *fluxional or integral calculus*. Before the invention of clocks, the sun-dial, the hour-glass, and the Clepsydron, constructed on the principle of water dripping through a small orifice,— were the only instruments used for measuring time.

[1] See Burke's Works, Vol. II, p. 514, et seq.

23. In the thirteenth century, Painting was revived in Italy by Giunta of Pisa, Guido of Sienna, and the great Cimabue of Florence. Thus was commenced that great Italian school of painting, which afterwards produced a Raphael, a Titian, a Michael Angelo, a Domenichino, a Hannibal Caracci, and a Leonardo da Vinci.

24. Silk was almost unknown to the ancients. Among the unpardonable extravagances of the Roman emperor Heliogabalus, in the third century (A. D. 222), historians enumerate his having had a garment entirely of silk! The silk worm was brought from the East Indies or China to Constantinople in 552, and the Italians first introduced its culture into Europe in the twelfth century. Roger, king of Sicily, deserves to be mentioned, as the first who called the attention of Europe to this subject. The silk manufactures of Italy, France, and Flanders flourished to a wonderful extent in the thirteenth and following centuries, and the beautiful specimens of gold lace, and splendidly flowered and variegated silks of that period, equal, if they do not surpass, anything of the present enlightened days. Many of them may be seen in the old cathedrals and museums of Europe.

25. Those ages had the merit of originating and carrying to the greatest perfection, a new style of Architecture. Who has not admired the splendid specimens of Gothic architecture still visible throughout Europe; specimens which, even in the ruins, which the fanatical vandalism of the sixteenth century has left of many of them, in England, Ireland and Scotland, are imposing still! How massive, and yet how light, is that order of architecture. How complicated the parts, and yet how simple the effect of the whole! The massive walls and the vast pilasters, as well as the pointed arch, the delicate creeper, the clustered column, and the fairy tracery,—all contribute their parts to the effect. Take for example, the famous cathedral of Pisa, with its leaning tower, or rather the latter only. Can modern skill and architecture rear a pile like that: upwards of 200 feet high, six stories high besides the basement and pinnacle, with 209 beautiful marble columns encircling it, and leaning between fifteen and twenty feet from the perpendicular! It was built by William of Norimberg and Bonanno of Pisa, in the twelfth century, and has been standing for more than six hundred years.

Let men of the present day build an edifice like this; let it stand six hundred years, and then, if it be still firm and uninjured, they may sneer at the darkness of the Middle Ages!

V. LITERATURE AND THE CATHOLIC CLERGY.

WHAT HAVE THE CATHOLIC CLERGY, AND ESPECIALLY THE MONKS, DONE FOR LITERATURE?

Modern history unfair—A great conspiracy against the truth—Whence this unfairness in English writers—Robbery and sacrilege—Origin of modern mammonism—Persecution of slander—What Protestants have said in favor of the Monks—Leibnitz—Ellendorf—Edmund Burke—Raising up the lowly—Giving asylum to the oppressed—Bishop Tanner—Mallet—Drake—Sharon Turner—Bates—Quarterly Review—Origin of Libraries—Ancient Christian Libraries—Cathedral and Monastic Libraries—Monks transcribing books—And collecting them into libraries—Care of books enjoined by rule—Zeal of monks in saving books—Principal monastic collections of Manuscripts—Scarcity of books—Agency of the Universities—Religious women engaged as copyists—Writing with golden and silver ink—Illuminated margins—The *Scriptorium*—Means of augmenting Libraries—Encouragement afforded by Roman Pontiffs—What we owe to patient monastic labor—Summary of what the Clergy and Monks have done for literature.

Since the time of the self-called reformation, the very fountains of history have been polluted. Writers with violent prejudices have been too much in the habit of viewing the history of the good old Catholic times through the gross and distorting medium of their preconceived opinions; and the result has been, that the pictures they have drawn of those times have scarcely one light or shade true to nature. So false are these, in fact, and so hideously deformed, "*Ut nec caput, nec pes uni reddatur formæ;*" — "nor head, nor foot is placed aright."

Without taking the trouble to consult the original documents, they have, in most cases, blindly and servilely copied one another's statements; and thus error has been perpetuated from generation to generation. The public taste in regard to every thing Catholic has been so long, and so deeply, and so widely vitiated, that it requires some moral courage now-a-days to depart from the beaten track of error, and to tell the whole truth, according to the records of faithful history. The man who undertakes this laudable task, runs the risk of having his production treated with neglect by the community, and abandoned to the moth and dust of some neglected shelf. Books, to be purchased and read, must pander to popular prejudice; and hence it is that the infection has spread so widely. Avarice in book-makers and book-publishers has been a fruitful source of historical errors, and consequent popular deceptions.

To convince ourselves that this is not an exaggerated or unfair statement, we have only to open any of our works of popular literature, in the English language. From the primer and first books of history taught in our preparatory academies, up to works on philosophy and science used in our colleges, almost all are tainted with this stain of prejudice. It is the seasoning which gives them zest. Perhaps, too,—just to infuse into the tender minds of children a holy horror of "Popery,"—the pages of school-books will be occasionally adorned with *beautifully executed* wood cuts, representing some scene of horror, in which priests and monks are exhibited as exulting over the agony of tortured victims! "Popish cruelty, monkish ignorance and superstition, the tyranny, the corruptions and abominations of the Church of Rome, the poor priest-ridden people, the avaricious exactions of the Popes,"—and a thousand such malicious exhibitions of cant, crowded together often without measure or reason,—meet our wearied eye at every page. It is unhappily but too true, then, as the accomplished De Maistre has well said, that during the last three hundred years, history has become a great conspiracy against truth. This is especially the case with historical works written in the English language, in which, as William Cobbett has bluntly, but truly said, "there are more lies than in books written in all other languages put together."

Whence this combination against truth among English writers? Whence this deep and abiding prejudice against Catholicity, transmitted as a fatal and poisened heritage from England to America? To detect its source, we need only glance at the history of the so called reformation in England.

At the beginning of this revolution, the Catholic Church was immensely rich. The property of the churches and of the monasteries had been accumulated during centuries of Catholic charity and liberality. The Church, however, held it only in trust, for the benefit of the public, and especially of the poor. It had been bestowed for this special purpose. The Catholic bishops and clergy, having no families to provide for, naturally left their property to the Church, or for charitable purposes. The spirit, and even the letter, of the canon law compelled them to do this. The poor were thus supported out of a fund, which the piety of ages had created for their benefit. There was then little pauperism, and there were no poor laws in England. The charity and the liberality of the Catholic Church, which was ever the tender mother of the poor, supplied the place of legal enactments and of heavy taxation for their support. Well, when the storm of the reformation broke over England, this vast property was seized upon by the officials of Henry VIII., who pounced upon it, as a falcon on its prey. It exchanged hands. It was violently torn from the Church and from the poor, and given to the courtiers and *courtesans*. In one instance, Henry VIII. gave a church estate to a woman, who had made a pudding to suit his royal taste! Sir Miles Partridge won a ring of church bells from him, by a throw of the dice! During his reign, and that of his son and successor, Edward VI., the work of sacrilegious spoliation was begun and consummated.

The Church was thus violently robbed, and her property, diverted from its proper channel of public charity and utility, went to enrich the spoilers, who fattened upon the bounty of a court whose vices they flattered. Avarice was thus seated, in sacrilegious triumph, on the altars which it had stripped and desecrated. And it has been the besetting sin of the world ever since the reformation. It is the image, in fact, stamped upon the minds and characters of mankind by this violent revolution. We refer those who may think this picture exaggerated, to the acts of Parliament, and to the statute book of England.[1]

Can we wonder that those, who thus became enriched with the spoils of the Church, should have labored to asperse the character of her ministers, who were the previous holders of the property? It is a principle of perverse human nature, *to hate those whom we have injured;* and the spirit of English Protestant writers, in regard to the Catholic Church, exhibits a frightful carrying out of this wicked maxim. Add to this, that, for nearly two hundred years after the reformation, the Catholic press was gagged in England, and the English Catholics themselves, and especially their natural defenders, the clergy, were subjected to a most cruel persecution; and you have a full solution of the whole problem,—a satisfactory reason, drawn from the nature and facts of the case, for this wide-spread, unchecked, and long-continued persecution of slander against Catholics, and against every thing Catholic. In shaking off the yoke of English tyranny, what a pity that we did not throw off also the more galling yoke of English prejudice! Alas! instead of ridding themselves of this thraldom likewise, our countrymen have courted it rather, and have delighted even to chew the rejected cud of English bigotry!

As the world advances in knowledge, and as mankind become calmer and more earnest in their inquiries after truth, it is to be hoped that a better spirit will dawn, and that the clouds, which now envelop modern history, will be dissipated.

We propose, in this paper, to lend our humble aid to the bringing about of this blessed consummation, by briefly showing what the Catholic Clergy, and especially the Monks, did for Literature before the dawn of the reformation, *so called.* And that our readers may the more readily follow our line of illustration, we will first show what enlightened Protestant writers have testified on the subject; and secondly, we will endeavor to prove, from original documents, that the judgment of these distinguished Protestants is based on the genuine facts of history.

I. Amidst the dark and cloudy night of Protestant prejudice against the Catholic Church, the attentive observer may notice here and there, in the openings of the clouds, a star brightly glimmering, and filling his bosom with hope. The great Leibnitz was one of those "bright, particular stars." His vast and luminous mind not only led him to eschew prejudice, but conducted him to the very portals of the sublime temple of Catholic truth.[1] To understand his testimony, we must remark, that the Abbé Rancé, the founder of the order of Trappists in France, was opposed to the special cultivation of Literature by the monks of his order. He wished them rather to spend their time in prayer, and in agricultural pursuits. His opinion was singular, and in fact unprecedented in monastic history, as we trust to make appear in the course of this essay. The learned Benedictine, Mabillon, entered the lists, and in a very learned and able work on "Monastic Studies,"[2] completely demolished the position of his adversary. Leibnitz, adverting to the same opinion, says: "If that opinion had obtained, we would have no erudition at the present day. For it is manifest that both books and letters have been preserved by the aid of the monasteries."[3] He instances the famous monastery of Corbeia, "which, through its monks, excelling not less in learning than in piety, spread the light of the faith throughout the entire north" of Europe.[4]

---

[1] William Cobbett has triumphantly established all this and much more: and his two volumes containing "The History of the Reformation in England," though the spirit they breathe might have been less harsh, have never been answered, for the very obvious reason that the facts they disclose are wholly unanswerable. The second volume contains an elaborate catalogue of the church and monastic property that was seized on or destroyed; the rental of which he estimates at one-third that of the entire kingdom.

To this splendid testimony in favor of the monks, we add that of Ellendorf, another distinguished German Publicist. He testifies that, "without the clergy, and chiefly without the monks, we would not have now the works of the fathers, nor of the classics."[5] We might also, were it deemed necessary, add the testimonies of Voigt, of Hurter,[6] and of many other late German Protestant writers. Their works are comparatively recent and are well known to the learned; and besides, the passages from their writings which would illustrate our subject, are too numerous and too copious to find a place in a paper which must be necessarily brief. Thus the first part of Europe which rebelled against Catholicity, was also the first to do it a measure of justice.

Turn we now to England, of which we may say with some truth, what St. Leo the Great said in substance of Pagan Rome: that she has afforded an asylum to sects of every hue, and has patronized and defended the errors of all innovators. One of the most accomplished Protestant writers, Edmund Burke, in his "Abridgment of English History,"[7] bears abundant testimony to the services which the English monks of the *"dark"* ages rendered to Literature and to civilization. He proves that, besides copying books and gratuitously teaching the poor in their schools, they instructed the people in agriculture, in the art of fishing, and in various other useful occupations. A desire of the people's welfare appeared in all their actions. When they received large donations of lands, they immediately baptized and manumitted their new vassals. Thus, baptism, in their eyes, broke the bonds of the slave, and restored him to freedom.[1] By pursuing this enlightened course, the monks greatly contributed to the destruction of serfism, a species of domestic servitude, which was a part of the older feudal system; and they raised up the lower orders in the scale of society. To the spirit of the Catholic Church, thus acting through them, and through various other mediums, is Europe mainly indebted for her present civilization, one important element of which was the abolition of serfism.

---

[1] In his Systema Theologicum, which the writer of this paper possesses, in German and Latin, this great Protestant Philosopher explains and defends almost every doctrine of the Catholic Church. The work was published after his death, and its authenticity is unquestioned.

[2] De Studiis Monasticis, vol. i, 4to.

[3] "Si ea invaluisset opinio, nullam hodie eruditionem haberemus. Constat enim libros et literas monasteriorum ope fuisse conservatos."—Tom. v, Opp. Ep. 14.

[4] "Quæ, monachis doctrina non minus quam pietate præstantibus, fidei lumen per totum septentrionem sparsit."—Ibid.

[5] De Hierarchia, tom. i, c. 4.

[6] He has since become a fervent Catholic.

[7] See his works, in three volumes, octavo. Vol. ii, ch. ii, p. 514, et seq.

In enjoining penance on the great and the rich, they frequently recommended works of public utility: "Let him also repair the church of God; let him improve the public roads, and build bridges over deep waters and muddy places; let him manumit his own serfs, and pay for the ransom of those of others, so that these may enjoy liberty."[2] The monks were also austere and exemplary in their morals; spreading the "sweet odor of Christ" around their humble sphere of life, and rendering virtue lovely in the eyes of the people. They were disinterested and free from the stain of avarice. "So free," says the venerable Bede, "were the priests of that time from avarice, that they would not accept of landed property, unless through compulsion."[3] Finally, according to Burke, in those ages of disorder and civil feud, the monasteries were places of secure refuge for the afflicted and the oppressed. When hunted down by their oppressors, these could fly to the monasteries, which were sacred asylums, respected even by the most lawless. It was the same, by God's express appointment, under the old law, which provided certain cities of refuge for the forlorn outcast.

The English Protestant bishop, Tanner, has written a work expressly on the monastic institutions of England and Wales.[4] In the preface to this book, he bears unequivocal testimony to the literary merit and moral worth of the monks of England. "In every great abbey," says he, "there was a large room called the *Scriptorium*, where several writers made it their whole business to transcribe books for the use of the library. They sometimes, indeed, wrote the Leger books of the house, and the Missals, and other books used in divine service; *but they were generally upon other works: the Fathers, Classics, Histories, etc.*"[5]

He proceeds to state that John Whethampstead, abbot of St. Albans, caused eighty books to be thus transcribed; and that fifty-eight were written out by the care of the abbot of Glastonbury. He says: "In all the greater abbeys, there were persons appointed to take notice of the principal occurrences of the kingdom, and, at the end of the year, to digest them into annals." The acts of parliament and of ecclesiastical councils, as well as the great charters of rights, were sent to these abbeys for registration and safe-keeping.[1] Magna Charta was preserved in them. The monasteries "were schools of learning and education; for every convent had one person or more appointed for this purpose; and all the neighbors that desired it, might have their children taught grammar and church music, *without any expense to them*. In the nunneries, also, young women were taught to work, and to read English, and sometimes Latin also. So that not only the lower rank of people, who could not pay for their learning, but most of the noblemen's and gentlemen's daughters were educated in those places."[2]

---

[1] Spellman Council, p. 329; cited by Burke, ibid.

[2] Instauret etiam Dei ecclesiam, et instauret vias publicas, pontibus super aquas profundas, et super cœnosas vias; et manumittat servos suos proprios, et redimat ab aliis hominibus servos suos ad libertatem.—L. Edgari, c. 14. Apud Burke, ibid.

[3] "Adeo enim sacerdotes illius temporis erant ab avaritia immunes, ut nec territoria nisi coacte acciperent."—Beda, lib. iii, c. 26.

[4] "An Account of all the Abbeys, Priories, and Friaries, formerly existing in England and Wales."—Referred to by Cobbett in his fourth Letter, Nos. 182, et seq.

[5] Preface, p. 19, et seq.

We are constrained to omit several other passages, in which the Anglican bishop bears willing testimony to the monasteries of England, as hospitals for the poor, — as houses of free entertainment for all travelers, — as places of great advantage to the common people living in their vicinity, by making them easy tenants, and by furnishing a ready market for whatever they were able to produce on the soil, — and finally, as great architectural ornaments of the country.

To this unexceptionable testimony of an English Protestant bishop, we add the following Protestant evidence on the same subject. Mallet, the historian of Switzerland, says: "The monks softened by their instructions the ferocious manners of the people, and opposed their credit to the tyranny of the nobility, who knew no other occupation than war, and grievously oppressed their neighbors. On this account the government of monks was preferred to theirs. The people sought them for judges. It was an usual saying, that '*it was better to be governed by a bishop's crozier, than by the monarch's scepter.*'"[3]

Drake assures us, on the authority of Warton,

> "That the monks of Monte Cassino (in Italy), were distinguished, not only for their knowledge of science, but for their attention to polite learning, and their acquaintance with the classics. Their learned abbot, Desiderius, collected the best Greek and Roman authors. The fraternity not only composed learned treatises on music, logic, astronomy, and the Vitruvian architecture, but likewise employed a portion of their time in transcribing Tacitus, etc., etc. This laudable example was, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, followed with great spirit and emulation by many English monasteries."[4]

Sharon Turner, in his History of England, speaks of the monasteries after this wise:

> "No tyranny was ever established, that was more unequivocally the creature of popular will, nor longer maintained by popular support: in

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid. [3] History of the Swiss, vol. i, p. 105. [4] Literary Hours, vol. ii, p. 4[illegible]5.

no point did personal interest and public welfare more cordially unite, than in the encouragement of monasteries."[1]

Bates, another Protestant writer, recommends the establishment in England of a species of Protestant nunneries for the instruction of young ladies, in order to counteract the influence of Catholic female convents. He says:

> "Thus might the comfort and welfare of many individuals be promoted to the great benefit of society at large, and the interests of popery, by improving on its own principles, be considerably counteracted."[2]

Protestants, some years ago, tried this experiment in London, but the affair turned out an utter failure. However, the elopements extraordinary which broke up the attempted establishment, *were* perhaps "an improvement on the principles of popery!" The whole business, like all other previous attempts at reformation by Protestants, ended, as Erasmus had caustically observed, "in the comedy of marriage!" Alas! Protestantism has not vitality enough for such undertakings.

We will close this mass of Protestant testimony, by a beautiful passage from the Quarterly Review, for December, 1811:

> "The world has never been so much indebted to any other body of men, as to the illustrious Order of Benedictine monks. . . Tinian and Juan Fernandez are not more beautiful spots on the ocean, than Malmesbury, Lindisfarne, and Jarrow were in the ages of our heptarchy. A community of pious men devoted to literature, and to the useful arts, as well as to religion, seems in those days like a green Oasis amid the desert. Like stars on a moonless night, they shine upon us with a tranquil ray. If ever there was a man who could truly be called *venerable*, it was he to whom the appellation is constantly fixed, Bede, whose life was passed in instructing his own generation, and preparing records for posterity. In those days the Church offered the only asylum from the evils to which every country was exposed, — amidst continual wars, the Church enjoyed peace, — it was regarded as a sacred realm by men, who, though they hated one another, believed in and feared the same God. . . The wise as well as the timid and gentle fled to the *Goshen* of God, which enjoyed its own light and calm amidst darkness and storms."

II. According to our plan, we will now endeavor to prove, that this Protestant homage paid to the institutions of the Catholic Church is based upon the facts of anthentic history, derived from original documents. And while pursuing this line of illustration, we will be enabled to see more in detail what the Catholic Clergy and the Monks have done for Literature.

Before the invention of the art of printing by Guttenberg and his associates, about the year 1436, the scarcity of books was perhaps the greatest difficulty with which Literature had to struggle. Books, which could be multiplied only by the tedious process of copying by hand, were necessarily scarce and dear. It cost a man almost the labor of a life-time, to obtain even a scanty library by this means. At the present day, when books have been so vastly multiplied, we can hardly form an adequate idea of the obstacles which our forefathers had to overcome in the middle ages. It ill becomes us to sneer at their ignorance, when, due allowance being made for the difficulty of their position in this respect, they might perhaps compare advantageously with us, in ardor and zeal for the promotion of learning. Besides, by their patient labor in the transcription of books, they preserved *for us* the treasures of ancient Latin and Greek Literature, — to say nothing of the Fathers and of the sacred writings, — and they thereby laid the foundation of modern literature, and made it *possible* for us to be learned. Gratitude for a service so important, should incline us to leniency in judging of their progress in letters. But they need not our mercy; all they demand is our justice. If they be judged according to this standard, they will not suffer by comparison even with our enlightened age, every thing being taken into the account.

---

[1] Vol. ii, pp. 332 and 361. We suppose that hard word *tyranny* was thrown in as a *douceur* to Protestant prejudice. It requires more acute optics than ours to perceive how that can be "tyranny," which is "unequivocally the creature of popular will," and which combines "personal interest and public welfare."

[2] "Rural Philosophy," p. 222.

The history of the formation and preservation of libraries before the art of printing, is one of the most interesting and useful branches of literary inquiry. It is an investigation intimately connected with the advancement of learning during the middle ages, as well as with its present condition. Those who founded and multiplied libraries deserve the immortal gratitude of this age. We propose to show: 1st, how libraries were founded throughout the Christian world, at the period in question, and what agency the Catholic clergy had in their establishment; and 2dly, how, and by what means, these libraries were increased and multiplied over the world.

1. Religion and Literature were always cultivated together. The library grew up with the school, under the shadow of the Church. Libraries were attached to most of the ancient churches, particularly to those of the patriarchal, metropolitan, and episcopal sees. Eusebius tells us of his frequent visits to the library attached to the cathedral church of Cæsarea. St. Jerome, in his Letters, often speaks of that connected with the church at Jerusalem. But the most famous collections of books among the ancient Christians were those at Rome, Alexandria, and Constantinople. That of Rome, in the famous Lateran Basilica, was founded by St. Hilary, a Pope of the sixth century. It was divided into two departments: the private, or that of the archives of the Roman church, and the public or classical, to which all could have access.[1]

Of the three libraries just mentioned, that of Rome alone has been preserved to our day. Transferred to the Vatican, it has shared the immortality of the "eternal city;" and it is at the present day the one which is most famous for old manuscripts, and the richest in ancient lore. The *suite* of rooms in which it is contained, is nearly a quarter of a mile long, and it is surpassingly rich and splendid. The library of Constantinople, containing about one hundred thousand manuscript volumes, was destroyed in one of those popular seditions so common in that city during the middle ages. That of Alexandria, supposed to contain no less than seven hundred thousand manuscript tomes, was burnt by order of the Caliph Omar, about the year 632. Its loss was an irreparable blow to Literature. Perhaps hundreds of works of the fathers, and of the ancient classics perished in that one brief conflagration.

---

[1] Vide Anastasius Bibliothecarius, — *in Vita Hilarii.*

In Germany, the cathedrals of Hamburg, Bamberg, Cologne, Paderborn, and many others, had extensive libraries adjoining them. Those attached to the cathedrals of England were no less famous.[1] The library was often a part of the church building itself. Among ancient writers, it was called by different names; — *Secretarium, Chartarium, Archivium, Scrinium, Librarium*, etc. St. Gregory the Great, about the year 600, wrote to Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria, who had asked him for a particular work: "That the book he sought for could not be found, either in the archives of the Roman Church, or in the other collections of the city:"—which passage proves that there were many libraries in Rome, at the close of the sixth century.

The agency of the Catholic clergy, both secular and regular, in forming the ancient libraries, is manifest from every document connected with the history of those establishments. Even in pagan times, the priesthood had been entrusted with the guardianship of books, profane as well as sacred. In ancient Rome, the temples of Apollo Palatine, of Peace, and of the Capitol, and in Egypt that of Serapis, were the depositories of books, of which the priests had charge. The Catholic clergy were always the chief librarians in the early times of the Church, and particularly in the middle ages. The Emperor Justinian ordered that copies of his laws should be kept in the principal churches of the empire, with as much care as the sacred vases. In many episcopal cities, such as Rome, Hippo, Vercelli, and Tours, the clergy lived in common with the bishop, and conducted flourishing schools under his eye. There were also schools adjoining the other cathedral, and even the principal parochial churches. This created a necessity for books. And accordingly, we find that those places were the *nuclei* of the most extensive libraries in Europe.

But the monks distinguished themselves most, both in the collection of books, and in the founding of libraries. Monasteries were founded in the east, as early as the fourth century. The rule of St. Pachomius enters into the most minute details, concerning the necessity of taking care of the books contained in the monastic library. Two monks were appointed in each house for this purpose. Each one was directed to have his own reading book. There were from thirty to forty houses belonging to this order, with an average of forty monks in each; so that the total number of monks was between twelve and sixteen hundred. The number of books was, by the monastic rule just alluded to, at least as great. And yet this monastic order made no special profession of letters; and the monks belonging to it were, many of them, simple and unlearned.

---

[1] See Heeren, Opp. 1, 65.

In the sixth century, the great Cassiodorus bequeathed his library, which he had collected with incredible labor, to the Solitaries; knowing "that among them alone could the faint rays of science be gathered together, increase, and form a great light, to enlighten the nations." St. Augustine, in his last will, recommended his library to the care of his priests, who lived in common with him, under a rule drawn up by himself. So great was the importance attached to the preservation of the monastic libraries, that St. Gregory the Great, himself a Benedictine monk, instituted a legal process in order to have a book restored to a monastery. The forty monks whom this sainted Pontiff sent out with St. Augustine to labor for the conversion of England, carried many books with them, and among others, a Homer.[1] We may as well state here, as elsewhere, that many ancient bishops were in the habit of carrying their books with them while traveling. This was the practice of St. Burchard, who flourished, A. D. 751; and of St. Bruno, who died 965. The disciples of Ratherius, the famous bishop of Verona, who lived in the tenth century, always sent his books before him, in his numerous journeys through Europe. Among these was a copy of Plautus, and another of Terence.

St. Bennet Biscop founded the famous Abbey of Weremouth in England, A. D. 674. He traversed Europe no less than five times, in order to collect books, and to establish a library in this his cherished monastery. The venerable Bede tells us that, by means of these peregrinations, "he brought into England an almost innumerable quantity of books of every kind."[2] These, on dying, he bequeathed to his disciples, holding them responsible before God for their preservation. His love for learning was thus his ruling passion, strong even in death. The abbots Ceolfrid and Egbert contributed much towards increasing this venerable library.

The great Alcuin, in the beginning of the ninth century, wrote in Latin verse a catalogue of the books belonging to the famous library at York. From this catalogue, which is still extant, it appears that York then possessed the works of most of the fathers, as well as of the ancient classics.

The libraries of the monasteries were often called *armoria*, or armories. The abbot of the monastery of Beaugency, in the twelfth century, assigns the reason for this name, by observing, that "libraries are as essential to monasteries, as armories are to armies in time of war." The saying of Mathias Mittner, in the sixteenth century, was a stated maxim among the monks of the middle ages: "*Ignorance is everywhere the mother of vice.*"[3]

The care which the monks were bound by their rule to take of their books, is truly astonishing. At Citeaux, a reader was not allowed to leave his book alone, even for a moment; he was obliged to replace it in the *armory*, or leave it in charge of another. St. Isidore directed that books should be returned to the library every evening. The rule of the great Chartreuse monastery directs, that "books be most cautiously and diligently kept, as the food of our souls." The abbot Riquier (eleventh century), at the close of a catalogue of books he had drawn up, exclaims: "This is the wealth of the cloister,—these are the riches of the heavenly life!"[1]

---

[1] See Lingard's Antiquities of the Anglo Saxon Church, ch. x.

[2] "Innumerabilem omnis generis copiam (librorum) cum apportasse."

[3] "Ignorantia ubique multorum malorum est mater."

These and similar facts may serve to explain to us how it is, that in entering many of the libraries of Europe at the present day, we often read over the door an inscription, threatening excommunication against any one who will dare remove a book without the proper authority. This is a relict of mediæval solicitude for the preservation of books. Our own carelessness at the present time is rebuked by the ardent love of books in the olden days, at the ignorance of which we often nevertheless most unwittingly sneer.

Towards the close of the fifteenth century, Trithemius collected no less than two thousand volumes of valuable manuscripts. In his learned chronicles of the abbeys of Spanheim and Hirschau in Germany, he shows how much we are indebted to the monks for the preservation of ancient learning. Though the monasteries were generally held sacred, even by the barbarians, yet they were sometimes destroyed. In such cases, the books were saved by the monks in preference to any other property. Trithemius tells us, that when the monastery of Rossano was destroyed by the Saracens, in the tenth century, the holy abbot Nilus retired to Rome, deeply chagrined; and he reckons the parting with his books the greatest trial which this good man ever had to encounter. In 883, the abbey of Fleury was destroyed; but the books were saved by the care of the monks. So also, when the abbey of St. Gall was attacked by the Madgars in the tenth century, the monks fled to the mountains, carrying nothing with them but their books. The monks of Monte Cassino, when this monastery was assailed by the Lombards, in 685, had likewise the good fortune to save their library. To show the value set on books by the monks, the following fact may be adduced. St. Fulard, abbot of St. Dennis, in the eighth century, in a schedule of the property belonging to the monastery at his death, places the books immediately after the gold and silver.

The library of Spanheim, in Germany, contained two thousand volumes in the fifteenth century. According to the testimony of one of its monks, that of Novalaise in Piedmont contained, in the tenth century, more than six thousand books.[2] Leland, the librarian of Henry VIII., testifies that there were seventeen hundred manuscripts in the abbey of Peterborough in England. He also states that the library of the Franciscans in London was one hundred and twenty-nine feet long, and thirty-one feet broad, and that it was "well filled with books;" and that the abbey of Wells had a library with twenty-five windows on each side. According to Ingulphus, the library of Crowland had seven hundred volumes, when it was burned in 1090.

What has become of all these once splendid libraries, collected and pre-

[1] "Hæ sunt divitiæ claustrales, — hæ sunt opulentiæ vitæ cœlestis!"

[2] See Eugenii de Levis, *Anecdota Sacra*. Præf. xxviii.

served with so much care by the monks of the *dark* ages? Alas! they have been, almost all of them, dilapidated or wholly destroyed. The Goths, Vandals, and Saracens, were not the only enemies of learning, nor the only destroyers of libraries. Those who have been so much in the habit of sneering at "monkish ignorance and superstition," are the very ones to whom we are indebted, in a great measure, for this work of destruction! The reformation enkindled a fire which consumed them. The spoilers under Henry VIII. and Edward VI. destroyed many of those attached to the abbeys in England;[1] and not to multiply facts, the library of St. Benedict *sur Loire*, with five thousand volumes, was burned by the Huguenots in the sixteenth century.

2. By what means were the ancient libraries augmented and multiplied over Europe? We answer unhesitatingly, that it was chiefly by the patient labor and persevering industry of the monks, who flourished in the *dark* ages. Among the ancient Greeks and Romans, slaves were employed in the irksome occupation of copying books. The task of transcribing books, in Christian times, devolved chiefly on the monks, as we shall now proceed to show by undeniable facts.

Before the invention of the art of printing, it was very difficult to become an author. He who aspired to this enviable distinction, imposed on himself a labor truly Herculean. He had to travel from place to place, in quest of the manuscripts to which he wished to refer. These he was often obliged to correct, by collating them with one another; and, as he was not generally allowed to transport them from their place, in order to make the collation, he had frequently to stop and sit down patiently to the task of transcribing them, which was a work of months,—sometimes of years. Thus whole years of indefatigable industry were required, merely as a novitiate to authorship. We doubt whether at this day half the number of books would be composed, as we know to have been written in the middle ages, if so many obstacles had first to be overcome.

The great scarcity of books, which mainly induced all this labor, continued till about the middle of the thirteenth century. From this date, manuscripts became more abundant, especially in the great cities where the universities were established. Thus, in the year 1325, there were attached to the university of Paris twenty-three *stationarii*, or stationed booksellers, of whom two were women. Besides these, there were also a great many traveling hawkers of manuscripts. In order to obtain a license to sell, these booksellers were bound by law to take an oath to observe the regulations of the university, which forbade them to sell any books to strangers, or to keep on hand for sale any works besides those commonly used by the students. The motives of these local regulations seem to have been: to make the books used in the university cheaper, by creating a greater demand for them, and to keep the minds of the students from being distracted by reading works foreign to their course of study.

What we have just said of the university of Paris, may be also observed of those of Bologna, Rome, Padua, Pavia, Perugia, Naples, Salamanca, Valladolid, Alcala, Oxford, and Cambridge; attached to all of which were *bibliopolæ*, or booksellers, bound by certain university regulations.

---

[1] See Cobbett's History of the Reformation, vol. ii, for abundant proofs of this.

How were the shops of these booksellers filled with books? And how were the libraries of books, not kept on sale, maintained and augmented? In those distracted times, temporal princes had neither time nor inclination to copy manuscripts themselves, nor sufficient zeal for letters to induce them to employ copyists. The bishops and the secular clergy were in general too much occupied, to devote much time to this laborious duty. This task devolved chiefly on the monks, who lived in common, and had more leisure. To render the profession of copyist permanent and generally useful, required the joint labor of many acting in concert, under a rule which enjoined obedience, and recommended labor for the love of God. The monastic institute alone possessed these requisites, and offered motives so exalted for patient industry.

Prompted by views thus lofty, even religious ladies in the convents not unfrequently employed their time in transcribing books. Eusebius, the father of church history, speaks of young virgins employed as copyists by ecclesiastical writers of the first four centuries. Even as early as the days of Tatian, in the second century, the zeal of religious women for letters excited the bile, and provoked the satire of the enemies of Christianity. In the fifth century, St. Melania, the Younger, is praised by her biographer for the exactness, beauty, and rapidity of her writing. St. Cæsaria, and her co-religious in the sixth century, acquired great reputation for the same accomplishments.[1] In the eighth century, St. Boniface, the apostle of Germany, writing to an abbess, prays her to copy in golden letters the epistles of St. Peter.[2]

We may here remark, by the way, that the art of writing with golden and silver ink, now disused if not wholly lost, seems to have been very common in the *dark* ages. Many ancient manuscripts in this beautiful writing are still preserved. The writer of this paper, some few years ago, saw in the Vatican library at Rome, a splendid copy of a Greek New Testament written entirely in letters of gold. It is said to have been executed at Constantinople, in the eleventh or twelfth century.

Who that has visited the ancient libraries, has not admired the beautiful penmanship, the tasty marginal decorations, and the splendid pictorial illustrations, of many among the old illuminated manuscripts?[3] In many of these exquisite ornaments, the delicate hand of woman is readily traced. SS. Hamilda and Renilda, two Belgian abbesses of the ninth century, employed their time in transcribing manuscripts. An abbot of the Premonstrats in the thirteenth century, while traveling to collect books, prevailed on several religious ladies of Flanders to aid him in transcribing them.[1]

---

[1] See Mabillon—*Acta Ord. S. Benedicti*, Tom. 1, p. 668, *et seq.*

[2] Epist. 28.

[3] See on this interesting subject, two or three articles in that excellent French religious and philosophical monthly publication, *Annales de la Philosophie Chretienne*. The writer of those papers proves, by abundant evidence, to what perfection penmanship and miniature painting were carried in the middle ages.

All the monastic orders employed copyists among their inmates. St. Jerome and St. Ephrem of Edessa, strongly recommended this useful occupation to the eastern cenobites. The monks of St. Martin of Tours had no other manual labor.[2] In the sixth century, St. Ferreol laid down this rule for his monks: "let him paint the page with his hand, who does not cultivate the earth with the plow."[3] About the same time, the retired Roman senator Cassiodorus, while in his ninety-third year, wrote in his cloister of Virarium a special treatise on orthography. He was enthusiastic in recommending to the monks the employment of transcribing books. He calls it a godlike occupation, "multiplying celestial words, speaking to the absent, wounding Satan." Thus was the painful labor of the copyist ennobled and hallowed by the lofty motives of religion!

Next came the Benedictines, who, according to the testimony of St. Gregory the Great, were engaged, from the very infancy of their order, "in tilling the soil, and in transcribing manuscripts." We have already seen, from Protestant authority, how much Literature is indebted to this illustrious order. Every monastery had a *Scriptorium*, or a hall specially set apart for copying books. Alcuin recommends to those engaged in this occupation the strictest silence, in order to prevent mutual interruption, and to avoid dissipation of the mind, which, during so noble an employment, should be centered in God! The greater monasteries generally employed at least twelve copyists. For this duty, not only the younger monks, but often those of greater age and celebrity,—such as Alcuin, Dunstan, etc., were selected.

The monks were not, in fact, mere blind copyists; they were often men of learning, who carefully collated and corrected the manuscripts they were engaged in transcribing. As early as the sixth century, one of the oldest monks of the monastery of Mesmin, near Orleans in France, was employed in arranging and collating the books of the monastic library.[4] Alcuin, in the ninth age, was employed by Charlemagne in collating the manuscripts of the Bible, with a view to its correction. Charlemagne himself devoted part of his time to comparing various manuscripts of the four Gospels. About the same time, Lupus, abbot of Ferrieres, employed his leisure hours in transcribing and collating the manuscripts of the library belonging to his monastery. He mentions Sallust and other classical works, on which he was thus laboring.[5] In his Letters, he thanks Ansbald, abbot of Prum, for a copy of Cicero's Epistles; and Adalpard, for a revised copy of Macrobius.

One of the greatest literati of the middle ages, was the monk Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester II. In one of his many Epistles,[6] he earnestly recommended a revision and correction of the works of Pliny,—a labor, says he, which required great knowledge and critical skill. St. Anselm, writing to the archbishop of Canterbury, begs the loan of various books for the use of the monastery of Bec in Normandy, over which he then presided; but he desires that only the most correct copies be sent.[1] Lanfranc's revised edition of the holy Scriptures is well known by the learned, who justly prize it for its accuracy. In the Grand Chartreuse, the corrections to be made by the copyists were decided on in full chapter of the monastery.

---

[1] Le Beuf, *Autogr.* c. 1.

[2] Sulpitius Severus, *Vita S. Martini*—vii.

[3] "*Paginam, pingat digito, qui terram non proscindit aratro.*"

[4] See Petit Radel, *Bibliotheq.* p. 46.

[5] *Epist. ad Regimbert*, 104.

[6] Epistola, 7.

The *armarius bibliothecarius*, or librarian, was an officer of exalted dignity, both at court and in the libraries, especially in those of the monks. He had under his supervision a number of skillful copyists. The distance of place, and the difficulty of communication in those unsettled times, were great obstacles to the general collation and correction of manuscripts. These difficulties were, however, boldly met, and courageously overcome by the monks. Books were often interchanged. Thus Servatus Lupus and Eginhard were in the habit of exchanging works between their respective monasteries of Ferrieres and Fulda. The former, in a letter to the Abbot Alsig of York, asks for the loan of the works of Quintillian, as also of various works of St. Jerome, Bede, and other fathers; and he proposes a bond of the holiest friendship, to be based upon the intercommunication of prayers and books between the two monasteries of Ferrieres and York.

Besides the *Scriptorium*, the monasteries possessed various other resources for augmenting their libraries. The liberality of princes and of the people was often successfully appealed to, for this laudable purpose. Certain seignorial rights over the territory adjoining them, were another abundant resource. Many monasteries had also special rules contemplating the same object. Some required the novice, at his entrance into the religious order, to contribute something towards the library, or to furnish a copy of some work which was rare. Others had a rule which required scholars frequenting the monastic schools, to furnish each year two volumes of manuscripts transcribed by themselves. By all these means, and above all, by the patient industry of the monks, the monastic libraries became the richest treasures of Literature in the middle ages. In what is by many considered the darkest and most barren age of this period,—the tenth century,—we have already seen that the library of St. Benedict *sur Loire* had five thousand volumes; and that of Novalaise, in Piedmont, upwards of six thousand.

Throughout that whole period, Italy was the center of Literature, as well as the grand repository of books. The zeal of the Roman Pontiffs for the diffusion of learning, and for the distribution of books throughout the Christian world, cannot be sufficiently appreciated and admired. St. Gregory the Great was written to repeatedly on this subject, from Gaul and even from Alexandria.[2] St. Martin I. received petitions for books from Belgium and from Spain.[1] Pope Paul I. was asked by Pepin for Greek works, to be placed in the library of St. Dennis: among them were Aristotle, a treatise on Geometry, probably Euclid, and many others. Gerbert wrote no less than thirteen Epistles,[2] some of them to Roman Pontiffs, to ask for books. Among the works he most desired, were "Mamilius,—de Astronomiá," "Victorinus,—de Rhetoricá," and those of Lupitus of Barcelona.

---

[1] S. Anselmi, Epistolæ, b. i, 43.

[2] S. Gregorii, Epistolæ, xi, 56.

We have thus endeavored to show, both from Protestant authority, and from original documents,—What the Catholic Clergy, and especially the Monks, have done for Literature. The facts we have alleged must be blotted from the pages of history, before we can excuse many Protestant historians for charging the Catholic Church with fostering ignorance, and for habitually sneering at "monkish indolence and superstition." Without the generous and patient labors of these much abused men, how many of the works of the ancients, think you, would have been transmitted to us? Without them, the middle ages would have been a yawning gulf, which would have swallowed up all the literary treasures of antiquity. Without their indefatigable industry, we would not now be able to feast on the eloquence of Cicero and Demosthenes, nor to be charmed with the beautiful strains of Homer and Virgil.

The monks have been often charged with wantonly destroying many of the most valuable classical works of antiquity, in order to use the parchment on which they were written for copying out comparatively insignificant treatises on piety, or legends of the saints. But is it either just or fair to charge on the whole body of monks what was done by very few of their members, and by these only when pressed for the want of writing material necessary for transcribing books in daily use among them?[3] Are we to lose sight of the general, persevering, and almost inconceivable literary labors of this illustrious body of men, merely because, here and there, an ignorant monk could not properly appreciate a work of the ancient classics?

Besides, how can the accusers of the monks prove, that in more than one or two instances any classical work was really lost, even for a time, by the very rare act of copying another work on the same parchment? How can they show that when this took place, there was only *one* copy of the work thus mutilated, in the world? Yet they should establish all this to make good their accusation.

Again; in most of the instances in which we know of this abuse having occurred, the original work was not destroyed, but only obscured. And who was it that taught Europe how to decipher those hitherto hidden writings? Who, by skill and patient industry, revealed the hidden mysteries of the *Palimpsests*, and discovered the lost work of Cicero,—De

---

[1] Baronius, Annales ad Ann, 649.

[2] Ep. 180, et aliæ.

[3] After the subjugation of Egypt by the Saracens, in the seventh century, the supply of papyrus was cut off, and Europe suffered greatly from the scarcity of writing material. Muratori thinks that we are to ascribe, in a great measure, to the fact just mentioned the subsequent decline of letters in Europe.

Republica? Was it one of the loudly boasting, and bitterly sneering *literati* of Protestant Germany or England? No. It was an ex-Jesuit,—a Roman priest, living at Rome,—afterwards Cardinal Mai! And this was but one of his splendid literary achievements![1]

To conclude; it was a monk,—Roger Bacon,—who first discovered and explained those principles which, a little later, led another monk,—Schwartz, of Cologne,—to invent gunpowder; and which, more fully developed some centuries afterwards by the great Catholic philosopher, Galileo, enabled him to invent the microscope and the telescope. It was a monk,—Salvino of Pisa,—who, in the twelfth century, invented spectacles for the old and for the shortsighted. To the monks,—Pacifico of Verona, the great Gerbert, and William, abbot of Hirschau,—we owe the invention of clocks, some time between the tenth and twelfth centuries. It was the monks, who in the middle ages, taught the people agriculture, and who, by their skillful industry, reclaimed whole tracts of waste land. It was the monks who first cultivated botany, and made known the hidden medicinal properties of plants. It is to the monks, that we are in all probability indebted for the paper on which we write.

It was the monk Gerbert, who first introduced into Europe the arithmetical numbers of the Arabs, A. D. 991, and who thus laid the foundation of arithmetical and mathematical studies. It was a Spanish Benedictine monk,—Pedro da Ponce,—who, A. D. 1570, first taught Europe the art of instructing the deaf and dumb. It was a French Catholic priest,—the Abbé Haüy,—who, in a work published towards the close of the last century, first unfolded the principles of the modern science of mineralogy. It was a Catholic priest,—Nicholas Copernicus,—who, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, promulgated the theory of a system of the world, appropriately called after him, the *Copernican*, which is now generally received, and which led to the brilliant discoveries of Kepler and Galileo, and formed the basis of the splendid mathematical demonstrations of Newton and La Place.

Finally, it is to the missionary zeal of Catholic priests that we are indebted for most of our earliest maritime and geographical knowledge. The Catholic priest always accompanied voyages of discovery and expeditions of conquest; often stimulating the former by his zeal for the salvation of souls, and softening down the rigors of the latter by the exercise of his heroic charity. Catholic priests were, at all times, the pioneers of civilization; and the Cross always accompanied, it sometimes went before, the banner of mere earthly dominion.

---

[1] Those who may wish to see more on this highly interesting subject, are referred to Bingham, De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Scholis et Bibliothecis, tome iii; to Hospinianus, De Templis; to Komeler, De Bibliothecis; to Mabillon, De Studiis Monasticis, and Acta Ord. S. Benedicti; and to a series of very learned articles on the subject, in some late numbers of the Annales de la Philosophie Chretienne already mentioned.

VI. SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE "DARK" AGES.

Protestant boasting—Light and darkness—Revival of letters and the Reformation—Early and recent persecution of slander compared—Gibbon—Protestant theory—Lame argument—Early Christian Schools—Plato and Aristotle—Irish Schools—And Irish Scholars—Cathedral Schools—Charlemagne and Alfred—Councils ordering the erection of Schools—The monasteries—And monastic Schools—What was therein taught—Schools for the nobility—Signing in cipher—Female Academies—Literary ladies—Universities—In Italy—England—And France—Statement of Danielo examined—Curious incident in the history of the University of Paris—Three qualities of mediæval Schools and Universities stated and established—Who first founded Free Schools?—Glance at modern Universities.

Of all the puffs of this puffing age, none has been louder or of longer continuance, than that which has vaunted the triumphs of Protestantism in the matter of education. By dint of constant boasting, Protestant writers have almost persuaded the world, that its rise from barbarism, its enlightenment in literature, its progress in science and art, its present civilization, are all ascribable to the revolution, called by its friends the *reformation;* and that before that blessed event, all was darkness and wide-spread desolation. The Church sat down in the midst of this darkness, quite at home and at her ease: she made no effort to dissipate the gloom; she fostered it rather, as the thing above all others most suited to her wicked purpose, of infusing into the minds of men the deadly poison of error and superstition!

Such is the proudly boasting theory, which Protestant writers have sought to establish, rather by bold and reckless assertion, than by calm and solid argument. Verily, if history did not inform us, that a Catholic first invented steam navigation,[1] we should be greatly tempted to ascribe that invention also to the reformation! Since this religious revolution, there has been in the world one continual puff! puff!! puff!!!—and, amidst the accompanying noise and smoke, men's minds have been scarcely calm enough to form a correct judgment on the true facts of history. The Catholic Church, on the contrary, has boasted little, and done much; without vaunting her literary triumphs, she has really been the foundress of Schools and Universities, the fosterer of arts and sciences, and the mother of inventions; as will abundantly appear, we think, from the fact embodied in this Essay. Before Protestantism was ever heard of, she had struggled single-handed for centuries against ignorance and barbarism. She had already achieved a splendid triumph over these evils, some time before the dawn of the reformation. The brilliant literary age of Leo X., which was at its meridian of glory when Luther began his revolt, has never been surpassed,—if even rivaled,—by Protestants at any subsequent epoch.

---

[1] Blasco de Garay, a Spaniard, first constructed a Steam Engine for purposes of navigation, and in the year 1548, he made a successful experiment with it in the harbor of Barcelona, before Charles V. and all his court, and in presence of the whole city. The vessel with which he tried his experiment was of 200 *barrels* [tons?] burden. See Naverette—"Colleccion de Viages," and "A year in Spain," vol. i, p. 47.

Were this the place for such an investigation, facts might be accumulated to show, that the reformation, instead of advancing, retarded the progress of learning for a whole century. Amidst the confusion, angry polemics, and bloody civil wars, to which that revolution gave rise, men had neither time nor inclination to apply to the cultivation of letters. Great minds which, during "Leo's golden days," had directed all their energies to literary pursuits, were then destined to consume their strength in acrimonious religious controversy. Instead of drinking at the pure fountains of Helicon, they were doomed to slake their thirst at the troubled waters of controversial debate. The history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, remarkably sterile in literary improvement and invention, compared with the two previous ones, affords a striking demonstration of this position.

In more modern times, in our own age and country, the course pursued by Protestant writers towards the Catholic Church, on the subject of education, has been singularly unjust and inconsistent. Sometimes they accuse her of fostering ignorance, and at others, of monopolising education. These two charges are also not unfrequently made in the same breath, and in reference to the same time and place! In proof of this assertion, we confidently appeal to the line of argument adopted by the Protestant religious press in the United States, during the last quarter of a century. Whatever rule of conduct she pursues, the Catholic Church cannot please these fastidious gentry of the Protestant press and pulpit. Does she rear Schools and Colleges all over the land, going even beyond her means to bring education to the door of the humblest citizen? The cry is at once raised, that she wishes to monoplize education, and to use the influence thus obtained in order to make proselytes to her creed. Does she make no extraordinary efforts in behalf of learning? The old stereotype charge is rung in our ears, that she means to foster ignorance. Placed in a dilemma, analogous to that of her divine Founder and Spouse, while He was laboring for the redemption of mankind in the land of Israel, she may apply His language, in addressing the people of this age of boasted enlightenment: "But whereunto shall I esteem this generation to be alike? It is like children sitting in the market place, who cry out to their companions and say, 'We have piped to you, and you have not danced; we have lamented, and you have not mourned.'"[1]

The charge preferred against the Church,—of encouraging ignorance,—is as old as Christianity. The Christians of the first three centuries were sneered at for their poverty and their want of learning. This calumnious accusation is repeated over and over again, with singular gusto, by that heartless and sneering infidel, Gibbon; whose grandiloquent style and well rounded periods have contributed, perhaps more than the writings of any other enemy of Christianity, to poison the minds of youth, and to foster real ignorance, under the pretext of promoting philosophy. The greediness with which this and similar works are sought for and devoured in Protestant communities, is one out of many proofs, that all errorists sympathize with one another. Such works meet with very little sympathy in Catholic countries. In fact, the best refutation of the insidious history of "the Decline and Downfall of the Roman Empire," is the production of an Italian Catholic.[1]

---

[1] St. Math. xi, 16. *seq.*

In the fourth century, that arch enemy of Christianity, Julian the apostate, by legal enactments against the education of Christians in the Colleges and Schools of the Roman empire, sought to perpetuate this stigma of ignorance. The imperial persecutor had the heartlessness to sneer at the ignorance of Christians, and to prohibit their education in the same breath![2]

It is a singular coincidence in the history of mankind, that England, after the reformation, adopted precisely the same iniquitous course towards Catholic Ireland. By her statutes, it was penal for a Catholic to teach school in Ireland; and yet, as if exulting with fiendish delight at the mischief which this iniquitous law was calculated to produce, you might hear her loud and long protracted notes of triumph over the ignorance and debasement of the Irish;—a triumph not justified, however, by the facts, notwithstanding every English Protestant effort to foster ignorance!

The usual device of Protestant writers is, to accuse the Catholic Church of promoting ignorance, especially during the middle ages, in order that, availing herself of the general darkness of that period, she might the more easily establish her erroneous principles. This theory has been so often and so boldly stated, that it has almost passed current as truth in our *enlightened* age. Does the Catholic ask the Protestant to inform him, when even *one* of the Catholic doctrines, against which he protests, had its origin at any period subsequent to the Apostolic age? Perhaps some other response may at first be hazarded: but when driven from every other position, the answer will probably be, that the doctrine in question originated in the *Dark* Ages! And when asked further, when and *where* it was first broached during that period, the respondent shrouds himself triumphantly in the *darkness* of these ages, as in a panoply of strength, and thinks himself clad in a mail of proof! We have more than once been amused at *such* exhibitions of polemical skill.

And yet this argument, or rather subterfuge, has not even the merit of speciousness or plausibility. To borrow an expressive figure from the schoolmen of the *Dark* Ages, it is lame of both feet—*utroque claudicat pede:* the premises are not true, and if they were, the conclusion would not follow. In other words, it is not true, that the epoch in question was so *dark* as it is often represented; and even if it had been tenfold more so, it would not thence follow that Christianity could then have been more easily corrupted, than at any other more enlightened period.

---

[1] Spedalieri—"Rifutasione di Gibbon," 5 Vols. 12mo. An abridgment, at least, of this work should be given to the English community.

[2] And yet Gibbon, Tytler, and other historians much in favor among Protestants, are in the habit of eulogising this apostate, as the greatest philosopher and legislator of his age; while they have little but reproach and sneers to bestow on such men as Constantine and Theodosius! Another proof this of the tender kindred feeling existing amongst errorists of different shades of opinion.

To begin with this last position; did Christ any where say, that literature was intended to be a distinctive mark of His Church? Or that His promises to the Church were to depend for their fulfillment on the literary qualifications of His followers? Was the promotion of human learning a principal object of His divine mission? Had it been so, would He not have selected, as the heralds of His kingdom, men of talents and gifted with human learning, rather than poor illiterate fishermen? Would He not have sought out and commissioned, to found His religion, the philosophers and rhetoricians of Greece and Rome, in preference to twelve unlearned men selected for this purpose from the lowest walks of life in Judea? The truth is, that "He chose the foolish things of the world, that He might confound the wise, and the weak things of the world, that He might confound the strong: and the mean things of the world, and the things that are contemptible, and things that are not, that He might destroy the things that are; that no flesh should glory in His sight."[1] It was a leading maxim of His kingdom, that "knowledge puffeth up; but charity edifieth."[2] He promised, that the "gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church," built upon a rock;[3] without even once intimating that the fulfillment of this solemn pledge was to depend on the encouragement of human learning by His Church.

The other *foot* of the argument is equally *lame*. The Church has, in fact, always promoted learning, even in the most calamitous periods of her history. Men of every shade of opinion are beginning to pay this homage to truth. In Germany, in France, in Italy, and in England, writers of distinguished ability, without distinction of creed, have applied themselves with singular industry and success to exploring the hitherto neglected treasures of mediæval literature.[4] And the man who, with the result of all these literary labors spread out before the world, will still persist in calling the middle ages *dark*, only exhibits the *darkness* of his own mind on the subject, and resembles one who, blindfolded at mid-day, should persevere in declaring against all evidence that it was as *dark* as midnight!

---

[1] 1. Corinth. I. 27, seq.

[2] 1. Corinth. viii, 1.

[3] Math. xvi. 18.

[4] The principal writers on this subject are in Italy, Muratori Dissertationes de Antiquitatibus Medii Ævi 6 vols. folio — Tiraboschi — Storia Della Letteratura Italiana, 28 vols. 32 mo. — Bettinelli, Risorgimento, della Letteratura Italiana, 2 vols. 8 vo. — Andres, Storia di ogni Letteratura, 6 vols. 4 to. — Battini — Apologia dei Secoli Barbai 8 vols. 12 mo., — besides many others. In Germany, Heeren — Geschichte des studiums der classischen Litteratur im Mittelalter; Voigt — Geschichte Preussens, etc. etc. In England, Hallam, Maitland, and others. In France, Guizot, and, not to mention a host of others, a learned writer, who, over the signature "Achery," has lately written a series of very learned and able articles on this subject, published in the Annales de la Philosophie Chretienne, upon the treasures contained in which we shall draw copiously in this Essay. We shall also occasionally avail ourselves of Digby's great work, "The Ages of Faith," in which the reader will find every thing on this, and almost every other subject, — "gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, and stubble," put together with at least as much learning as order. This work is, in truth, an abyss of learning — *abyssus multa.*

We have elsewhere spoken in some detail of the services rendered to learning by the Catholic clergy, as well as of the condition of literature and the arts in the middle ages. What we purpose to do, at present, is, to furnish a summary sketch of the Schools and Universities founded by the Church during that period.

From the earliest ages, Schools and Colleges grew up under the fostering care of the Church. The most celebrated were those of Rome, Alexandria, Milan, Carthage, and Nisibis. Who has not read of the brilliant Christian Schools of Alexandria in the third century, where Christian youths, even amidst the darkening storm of persecution, were seen eagerly thronging the academic halls, to drink in the teaching which fell from the eloquent lips of the great Origen? Their ardor for learning could not be quenched, even by the blood of the almost numberless victims, who fell under the sword of a Decius and a Valerian. Who has not heard of the glory shed upon the Schools of Carthage and Rome by the great St. Augustine, in the beginning of the fifth century? Though Africa was his country, yet this illustrious man preferred the Schools of Rome, and he determined to reflect on this city the luster of his splendid talents. "The chief cause of my going to Rome," says he, "was my hearing that young men studied there more quietly, and that they were kept in order by a better discipline."[1]

In these earliest models of Christian Schools, sacred was justly preferred to profane learning; because the objects of the former were so much higher and nobler. Yet the latter was also cultivated, but was made to shine with light borrowed chiefly from the former. Great men then thought, that human learning had attained its highest standard of excellence, when its teachings were most conformable to the heavenly wisdom; when it reflected most the light of divine Truth—of God. But to meet, on his own ground, the votary of mere human learning, the Christian scholar was compelled occasionally to descend from his lofty eminence, into the arena of the Platonic and Aristotelian philosophies. The result of this condescension was, however, rather to elevate pagan philosophy, than to lower the loftier standard of Christian wisdom. At that period, Plato had the ascendant over the Stagyrite, particularly in the School of Alexandria; the latter, however, almost entirely eclipsed his more brilliant rival during many subsequent centuries. The famous Medicean School of Florence, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, restored Plato to his pre-eminence; and F. Schlegel greatly prefers him to Aristotle.[2] The Christian Schools borrowed from both what seemed best to suit their purposes; and though exclusive partiality for Plato betrayed Origen and other professors into some errors and extravagances, yet the influence of the ancient philosophy, thus moulded to the Christian standard, was generally highly beneficial.

---

[1] Confessions, B. v.

[2] In his "Lectures on the Philosophy of History."

The Church allowed a reasonable latitude to her children, interposing her authority, only when the precious deposit of faith was endangered.

For three centuries after her conversion to Christianity, Ireland took the lead of all Europe in the cultivation and promotion of literature. From the middle of the fifth, to the middle of the eighth century, she carried on what might be called a crusade of learning throughout all Europe. While the tide of barbarian invasion was rushing over the continent, burying under its turbid waves the relics of ancient literature and civilization, the Emerald Isle was devoting the repose, which Providence then granted her, to the practice of religion, the founding of Schools, and the cultivation of letters, both sacred and profane. The first of the northern nations to enter into the fold of Christ, she was destined to become one chief instrument in the hands of God, for the conversion and civilization of the others. A brilliant light then shot up from Ireland, which illuminated the whole western world. To give one instance of the flourishing condition of her institutions of learning during the period in question, it is well known, that the monastery of Benchor, or Bangor, contained no less than three thousand monks, besides scholars almost innumerable. Fired with enthusiasm, Irishmen visited almost every country in Europe, leaving behind them splendid institutions of learning and religion,—for these two always went hand in hand. Irishmen established the monastery and School of Lindisfarne in England, of Bobbio in Italy, of Verdun in France, and of Wartzburg, Ratisbon, Erfurth, Cologne, and Vienna in Germany;—to say nothing of their literary labors in Paris, throughout England, and elsewhere.[1]

In England, the episcopal sees became special nurseries of learning.[2] The same may be said of these sees in general, throughout the Catholic world. Wherever a cathedral church was erected, there also a School, with a library attached to it, grew up under its shadow. This was not a mere chance: it was the natural tendency and result of the Catholic religion. Catholicity and literature always flourished together. It was also a matter of canonical enactment. Ecclesiastical councils,—provincial, national, and general,—made this the settled law of the Church during the middle ages. It would be tedious to allege all the decrees of councils bearing on this subject, which is referred to by nearly a hundred of them, held at different places, and at different times. We will only adduce a few of the more remarkable.

A council held at Rome, in 826, under the Pontiff Eugenius II., ordained that Schools should be established throughout the world at cathedral and parochial churches, and in such other places as might be suitable for their erection. Towards the close of the eighth century, a council convened at Metz enjoined the obligation of erecting Catholic Schools, to be conducted by the clergy living in common with the bishop.

---

[1] For full particulars on this interesting subject, see Moore's "History of Ireland," vol. i. See, also, Annales de la Philos. Chret. Art. 7, sup. cit.

[2] Heeren, Opp. i. 65, who cites Henry's History of England.

The council of Mayence, in 813, ordered the clergy to admonish parents under their charge, that they should send their children to the Schools established, "either in the monasteries, or in the houses of the parochial clergy."[1] We gather from this and many similar enactments, that Schools were established not only at the cathedral, but also the parochial churches, as well as in the monasteries. The synod of Orleans, in 800, enacted, that the parochial clergy should erect Schools in towns and villages, in order to teach little children the elements of learning: "Let them receive," this council adds, "and teach these little children with the utmost charity, that they themselves may shine as the stars forever. Let them receive no remuneration from their Schools, unless what the parents, through charity, may voluntarily offer."[2] As early as 529, the council of Vaison had strongly recommended the erection of similar Schools. A cotemporary writer of the life of Bishop Meinwercus, represents the School of Paderborn, as "flourishing in both divine and human learning."[3]

The princes of the earth assisted the authorities of the Church, in carrying out these benevolent intentions. Charlemagne, in one of his Capitulars, ordered the erection of Schools at every cathedral church throughout his vast dominions, which extended over more than half of Europe. His successor, Lothaire I., in 823, promulgated a law, that public Schools should be established in eight of the principal Italian cities, "in order that an opportunity might be given to all, and that there might be no excuse drawn from poverty, and the difficulty of repairing to remote places." Half a century later, Alfred the Great enacted similar laws in England. Thus, during the Catholic times, the Church and the State—bishops and kings—vied with each other in zeal for the erection of Schools. They all felt that this was the best, if not the only remedy for European society, then torn by civil wars, or just emerging from the confusion caused by barbarian invasion. And if their good intentions were not always carried into effect, the impartial judge will admit that it was surely not their fault, but that of the evil times on which they had fallen. But for these noble exertions to restore learning, what would have saved Europe from hopeless barbarism? Even with all those efforts, the struggle between Christian civilization and northern barbarism, was long and doubtful. What would have been the result had not the Church interposed her powerful influence to stay the torrent?

We have seen the action of provincial and national councils favoring the erection of Schools: we will now show that general councils, representing the whole Church, made similar enactments. A canon of the third general council of Constantinople, in 680, commands priests to open Schools in country places, and to receive gratuitously all children who could be induced to frequent them. The third general council of Lateran was convened in 1179 by Alexander III., one of the greatest Pontiffs of the middle ages. It passed the following canon: "Since the church of God, like a tender mother, is bound to provide for the poor, both in those things which appertain to the aid of the body, and in those which belong to the advancement of the soul; lest the opportunity for such improvement (*agendi et proficiendi*) should be wanting to those poor persons who cannot be aided by the wealth of their parents; let a competent benefice be assigned in each cathedral church to a teacher, whose duty it shall be to teach the clerks and poor scholars of the same church *gratuitously*; by which means the necessity of the teacher may be relieved, and the way to instruction may be opened to learners. Let this practice be also restored in other churches and monasteries, if, in times past, any thing was set apart in them for this purpose. But let no one exact a price for granting permission to teach."[1] Another great Pope of the middle ages, Innocent III., renewed this decree in 1215, and extended the law to parochial churches. Honorious III., and other Pontiffs, followed his example.

---

[1] Concil. Moguntinum, Can. x.

[2] Concil. Aurelian An. 800, Can. xx.

[3] Digby's Ages of Faith, vol. ii, pp. 112-8,—American ed.,—where many similar facts are related.

Thus, FREE SCHOOLS were established throughout Christendom by the authority of the Roman Pontiffs, and by that of general councils. The Church promoted learning through her visible head, and both in her distributive and collective capacity. And be it ever remembered, that all the Schools above mentioned were established chiefly for the benefit of the common people and of the poor. In France alone, during those ages, there were more than two hundred such Schools and Colleges.[2]

The monasteries were powerful auxiliaries in the cause of education. Wherever they were established, the most barren waste was made to smile with verdure. Their retired situation, remote from the confusion and corruption of cities, adapted them in a peculiar manner to the purposes of education. The Christian youth could there drink to satiety of the pure waters of sacred and profane learning, far away from the turmoil of the world. His health was invigorated by the mountain or country air; his morals were preserved by the example and watchfulness of the monks; and both literature and religion became lovely in his eyes. In those troubled times of civil feud and bloodshed, the monasteries were asylums for learning,—green spots on the surface of creation,—which the foot of the spoiler seldom profaned. Who, that has read the history of the middle ages, has not felt refreshed in mind, as he revisited in spirit the monasteries of Cluny and Clairvaux; of Corbie and Bec; of Fulda and Bobbio,—not to mention a hundred other bright and favored spots! The shadows of St. Bernard, of Peter the Venerable, and of the abbot Hugo, seem still to hover over those holy sanctuaries, and to hallow them by their presence.

There were Schools in all the principal monasteries. Some of these were for primary, and others for higher instruction. In the former, boys were taught the "Our Father" the Creed, the Psalms, Plain Chant, Arithmetic and Grammar. In the latter, the more elevated branches of learning were inculcated; —Music, Mathematics, Poetry, and the Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic languages. At that period Grammar had a much more extended meaning than it has at present. It embraced, though perhaps in less perfection, what was afterwards denoted by the term *Humanities*, — a full course of instruction in the Latin language, which was, during the greater part of the middle ages, that of the people, — at least of all the educated, — as well as of the Church and of the State. The laws and ordinances of France were published in Latin until the sixteenth century. Till the beginning of the thirteenth century, most of the famous monasteries in Europe were of the Benedictine order, whose services to literature cannot be over estimated. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the monastic orders of St, Dominic and St. Francis covered Europe with Schools, which were chiefly for the benefit of the poor. And there is no doubt that these last named orders greatly promoted the rise of letters, and thereby the advancement of civilization. Speaking of the cathedral and monastic Schools of the middle ages, Hallam bestows upon them the following very faint and qualified praise:

---

[1] See Cabassutius—Notitia Concil. in locum. Digby (Vol. 2, p. 114) gives an imperfect synopsis of the decree, which however is marked as a translation of the canon. Besides, the marginal reference is incorrect, and without meaning.

[2] For proof this, see Annales de la Philos. Chretienne, Art. 7, sup. cit.

> "The praise of having originally established Schools belongs to some bishops and abbots of the sixth century. They came in place of the imperial Schools overthrown by the barbarians. In the downfall of that temporal dominion, a spiritual aristocracy was providentially raised up, to save from extinction the remains of learning and of religion itself. Some of these Schools seem to have been preserved in the south of Italy, though merely, perhaps, for elementary instruction. . . The cathedral and conventual Schools, created or restored by Charlemagne, became the means of preserving that small portion of learning which continued to exist. They flourished most, having had time to produce their fruits, under his successors, Louis the Debonair, Lothaire, and Charles the Bald."[1]

Besides Schools for the people, there were others, chiefly in the monasteries, for the special education of the children of the nobility and of kings. Meibom, a Protestant historian, assures us of this fact. "During the age of the Charles', of the Othos', and of the Henrys', the children of kings and dukes were placed at a tender age in the Schools of the canons and of the monks, . . that they might acquire a knowledge of the liberal arts, and of the languages."[2] The chronicler of St. Requier, who lived under the Carlovingian dynasty, tells us that in that abbey were educated one hundred youths, from the principal noble families of the empire. Charles Martel founded the College of Richenon for a similar purpose.

The kings and princes of the middle ages were not then so ignorant as they are usually represented. Charlemagne and Alfred were both not only scholars, but magnificent patrons of learning. They were the Medici of the middle ages. The fact that many of the ancient diplomas and other public documents are signed with the cipher, instead of the name of a prince, is no conclusive evidence that the signer could not write his own name. This practice was often a matter of court etiquette, originating in the idea, more or less common at that time, that a prince should write with no other instrument than his sword.[1] Those warlike nobles, clad in steel, did not much relish the old advice, — *cedant arma togæ.*[2] When king Lewis *d'outre mer* laughed at Foulk of Anjou, for having sung in the choir with the other canons, Foulk answered bluntly: "*An illiterate king is a crowned ass.*"[3] The same was said to Henry I. of England by his father, the bluff William the Conqueror. This fact proves that ignorance was deemed disgraceful in a prince of the middle ages. In the tenth century, St. Stephen of Hungary had his people taught the Latin language, which is still, to some extent, the vernacular tongue of that country.

---

[1] Introduction to Literature, etc. — 1, 27.

[2] See Ziegelbauer Opp. Tom. 1. "Sub ævo Carolorum, Othonum, et Henricorum, regum ducumque liberi tenelli adhuc in canonicorum aut monachorum collegia amandabantur . . ut liberalium artium et linguarum cognitioni assuefierent."

The following fact may serve to show that ladies of rank also cultivated learning during the period in question. In the eleventh century, Ingulph, who was reared in the court of Edward the Confessor in England, informs us, that on returning every day from school, the queen Egitha used to examine him in grammar and logic, and to encourage his progress by frequent presents. The nunneries did for the girls, what the cathedral, parochial, and monastic Schools did for boys; and every class, and both sexes were thus provided with ample means of education.[4] The Latin language was understood by many of the religious ladies of the convents: their rules were mostly in that language; and many small works written in Latin by nuns of those ages are still extant.[5] They also occasionally cultivated the study of the Greek language, and of philosophy. Some nuns of England with their abbess Liobe, a near relative of St. Boniface, the apostle of Germany, carried their learning into the latter country, and established Schools there for the education of their own sex.[6] In the tenth century, Hroswetha, a nun of Gandersheim, wrote Latin poems, still extant, on the foundation of her convent, and on the life of the emperor Otho the Great; besides six dramas on ecclesiastical history. Though far from being so classical as the ancient models, yet these poems are of respectable merit; and they prove, that in the institutions for learning at that day, — even in the tenth century, — classical literature was extensively and successfully cultivated, by women as well as by men.

Not only religious women, but ladies of the world also were not unfrequently well educated. They received their education in the convents. St. Bernard, in the twelfth century, wrote letters in Latin to the wives of counts and barons. The convent of Roncerai at Angers was distinguished by the number of young princesses who were there educated. It was in this school that Heloise learned Latin and philosophy. St. Gertrude, of Saxony, (fourteenth century,) extended her studies to the classics, to which she was so strongly attached, as to feel scruples of conscience on the subject. She has left some pious historical works.[1] The abbess Herrada of Alsace, (twelfth century) wrote an extensive Encyclopedia,[2] which is still preserved in manuscript. Many other facts of a similar character might be alleged, to illustrate female education in the middle ages; but these will suffice

---

[1] See Nouveau Traite de diplomatique, p. 861, — a learned work by the Benedictines.

[2] *Let arms yield to the gown — war to peace.*

[3] Rex illiteratus est asinus coronatus. — Martene, Collect. Ampliss. v. 987.

[4] The Annales de la Philosophie Chret. has a special article, (vi.) replete with interesting details, on the learned females of the middle ages.

[5] See Histoire Litter. de France, Tom. ix, p. 129, *seqq.*

[6] Mabillon Prof. in Sæcul. iii, Benedict.

Pass we now to the Universities of the "Dark" Ages, many of which were fully organized in the twelfth century, and became so numerous and flourishing in that and the following ages, as to excite our admiration and astonishment, even at this day of boasted enlightenment. The Schools and Colleges erected in the larger cities gradually swelled into Universities, which received special charters of privileges from Popes and princes. These soon became foci of learning, which radiated the light of literature throughout every country of Europe. Their great number, and the vast multitude of young men from every part of Europe who flocked to them, prove most conclusively how great was then the thirst for learning. Here again Italy pioneered the way. The Universities of Rome and Bologna soon became famous. Padua, Naples, Pavia, and Perugia, also had their Universities. After the discovery of the Pandects of Justinian by the Amalfites, in the eleventh century, the study of the civil law was revived in Italy. The University of Bologna became, under Irnerius, or Werner, the great Law School of Christendom. Thousands of students from the remotest parts of Europe crowded its halls. Besides Italian youths, there were occasionally at this University no less than ten thousand foreign students. Padua, the *Alma Mater* of Christopher Columbus and of Amerigo Vespucci, had at one time no less than eighteen thousand students.[3] The other Italian Universities were also in a highly flourishing condition.

The other countries of Europe boasted also their Universities, which rivaled those of Italy. England had her Oxford and her Cambridge. The Schools, founded in these two cities in the ninth and tenth centuries, grew to be Universities towards the close of the twelfth. The reign of Henry II. was the Augustan Age of English mediæval literature. Anthony Wood, the Protestant historian of the Oxford University, informs us that, during Henry's reign, it counted thirty thousand students![4]

Spain was not behind the other Catholic states of Europe. She improved on the scientific discoveries of the Arabs, who, during their long rule over her most beautiful provinces, had established many flourishing Schools, and made many discoveries in medicine and mathematics. To them all Europe was much indebted for the impulse, which their example and successful industry gave to these studies. The literary boon which they bestowed on Europe was not, however, without its poison. They paid at least as much attention to the study of alchemy, of necromancy, and of astrology, as to that of the useful sciences. They wasted as much time and labor on the discovery of the philosopher's stone, as they spent in cultivating the sciences of arithmetic, medicine, and astronomy. To their influence, we have no doubt, Europe was mainly indebted for the importance attached to these foolish studies by many of her Christian literati.[1] Besides the celebrated Universities of Salamanca, Valladolid, and Alcala, Spain could boast of twenty-four other Colleges of less celebrity. In addition to the Universities already enumerated, there were various Schools of Medicine in Spain, at Salerno in the south of Italy, and at Montpelier and Paris in France. These also gave a great impulse to the development of European literature and civilization.

---

[1] Insinuationes D. Pietatis.

[2] Hortus deliciarum.

[3] See Eustace's "Classical Tour" through Italy, in 4 Vols. 8vo.

[4] Athenæ Oxonienses. The famed School of Athens never had so many scholars.

The influence of the Universities of the middle ages was not confined to the mere imparting of learning. They kept up a constant intercourse in society, at a time when the masses had far less communication than at present. They excited the emulation of noble youths, and opened to them a path to eminence and glory, far more lofty than the battle-field, which had been hitherto almost their only incentive to exertion. They thus exercised a humanizing influence on the manners of an age essentially warlike. There was room, too, for the exercise of a species of chivalry, in the intellectual tilting matches of the Schools, no less than in the more exciting and less refined tournaments, where mailed knights broke their spears against each other, in pursuit of glory. Post-offices arose from the necessity of regular communication, which the Universities, with their vast number of foreign students created. The young men who had studied law at Bologna, Paris, and Oxford, on returning to their homes, excited in the minds of their countrymen an ardor for such studies. Besides, with their increased knowledge, they contributed greatly to improve the jurisprudence of their respective countries.

Thus civilization received a powerful stimulus from the Universities. The streamlets, which issued from these fountain-heads of literature, irrigated and fertilized all Europe. They were sources,

Whence many rivulets have since been turned,
O'er the garden Catholic to lead
Their living waters, and have fed its plants.[2]

In a learned Catholic Magazine, published monthly in Paris, we find an interesting Review of a work on the University of Paris, lately published by J. Danielo.[3] This distinguished author has written other excellent works manifesting deep research into the history of the middle ages. Not the least interesting of these publications, is his "History of Queen

---

[1] I cannot subscribe to the opinion of Andres, (Storia di ogni Lett. vol. i.,) who enters into an elaborate course of reasoning, to prove that Europe owed to the Arabs almost all her valuable discoveries in the middle ages. He was a Spaniard, and perhaps his partiality for his country inclined him to attach too much importance to Hispano-Arabic influence on the rise of Letters.

[2] Dante. Parad. xii.

[3] The work is entitled: "Etudes Literaires, Philosophiques, et Morales sur l' Universite de Paris, et sur les progres de l'esprit humain au moyen age:" or, Literary, Philosophical, and Moral researches on the University of Paris, and on the progress of the human mind in the middle ages." The Review alluded to, is found in the No. of the "Universite Catholique," for February, 1842.

Blanche," the sainted mother of St. Louis IX. From the Review just mentioned, we select the following details connected with our present subject:

> "We can form no idea at the present day," says M. Danielo, "of the importance and of the numbers of the University of France towards the close of the twelfth century. Rendered illustrious by Peter Lombard, St. Anselm, William de Champeaux, and Abeillard, it had already become the light and the rendezvous of the learned, and the resort of students from all Europe. The Holy See loved and protected it, as a cherished daughter, as its faithful shield and champion. It was the glory of the western world and of France, and no institution in all Christendom was its equal. Athens and Alexandria, according to the testimony of cotemporary writers, never had Schools so numerous, or so brilliant. In fact, the number of University students often exceeded twenty-five thousand! . . . The kings of France were as zealous to foster its growth, as were those of neighboring states to diminish its patronage. These employed every kind of intrigue to dissolve this great and illustrious body, and to cause the remnant of its students to pursue their education within their own territory. For this purpose they instituted Universities at great expense; they endowed them with lands and privileges; they offered all kinds of inducements to students. But their efforts proved abortive. In spite of the prohibition of the emperor Frederick, students continued to flock to the University of Paris from Germany, as well as from England and Italy. We should remark that this University, besides the advantages of its location, was very accessible and very hospitable. The students soon became acclimated in Paris; and after having completed their studies, it was easy for the most talented to obtain professorships, and we accordingly find more than one professor from Germany, Italy, and especially England, filling with distinction the various chairs. Add to this, that nearly all the celebrated men, and many of the Popes, bishops and abbots, of that period, were *elèves* and admirers of the University of Paris; many of them too had been among its professors, and respectfully called it their mother."

We have no doubt that the above account is substantially correct, though we are disposed to think, that the ardent partiality of the Frenchman has in one or two instances betrayed him into no little exaggeration. Though the French University was highly distinguished, yet it had many rivals, which equaled, if they did not surpass it, both in the number of their students, and in the learning and fame of their professors. Not to speak of others, those of Bologna in Italy, and of Oxford in England, could boast at least equal antiquity and celebrity. The former had the merit of reviving the study of the civil law under the great Werner; and as a Law School, both for the civil and the canon law, it long continued unrivaled. The latter under Henry II. of England, whose reign commenced about the middle of the twelfth century (1154,) reckoned thirty thousand youths among its students,—a number which that of Paris never perhaps surpassed. The statement, that "nearly all the celebrated men" of that epoch were students of the Paris University, must also we have no doubt, be received with many grains of allowance. "The glory of the western world and of France," had laurels enough already, without snatching at those which decorated the brows of her fair sisters in Italy, Spain, and England.

With twenty-five or thirty thousand young men from all nations within its walls, it was natural to expect that Paris during the middle ages should become occasionally the theater of riot, growing out of contentions between the students and the citizens. If we are to credit cotemporary history, the former often equaled the latter in number. M. Danielo gives us, from Roger de Hoveden, an English historian of the time, a graphic account of one of those outbreaks, which resulted in the famous charter of rights granted to the University by Philip Augustus, in 1200. It seems, that the German students of that day liked their social glass, almost as much as their successors in the German Universities do at the present time. One of them, the son of a nobleman, sent his servant to a tavern to purchase wine. The servant, it appears, misbehaved, and was chastised by the tavern-keeper; and in the encounter, the flask of wine was broken. The German students felt aggrieved both in their honor and in their stomachs. They assembled in great numbers, repaired to the tavern, forced its doors, and severely chastised the landlord, leaving him half dead. The citizens of Paris, indignant at this severe retaliation of the students, assembled, and led on by Thomas, the provost of the city, an armed mob assaulted the hotel of the German students. In the conflict which ensued, the young German nobleman and several of his comrades, were killed.[1] The heads of the University repaired in a body to Philip Augustus, king of France, and complained loudly of this violence. The king at their instance took signal vengeance on the provost and his accomplices; and to protect the students, as well as to prevent similar outrages in future, he granted to the University an ample charter of privileges, which, among other things, exempted it from the jurisdiction of the provost and of the civil courts, and made it amenable only to the ecclesiastical tribunals. Under this charter, the University continued to flourish for several centuries. But half a century later, its prosperity received a temporary check from Queen Blanche and St. Louis IX. The Pope, however, soon interfered, and, by his influence with the French court, succeeded in having all the privileges of the University restored.

The reason of the withdrawal of the charter by the sainted king and queen mother of France, was probably a zeal for the Catholic faith, which one or two of the professors made an effort about that time to undermine. The French University, though generally "the faithful shield and champion" of the Church, was occasionally tarnished with heresy; which did not, however, affect its entire body, but was confined to a few of its professorial chairs. The pride of learning and the habit—encouraged by the Aristotelian philosophy—of defending both sides of every question for the sake of argument, had already betrayed Gilbert de Porée and Abeillard into many errors and extravagances; and even the great "master of the sentences," Peter Lombard, had not, it was thought, wholly escaped the contagion. But the professors who, in the thirteenth century, were betrayed into the greatest excesses, were Simon de Tournai and Amaury. The blasphemies of the former, and the signal punishment which overtook him in the midst of them, are so remarkable, that we will give the account of them in full, as furnished us by the caustic Benedictine monk, Mathew Paris, a cotemporary English historian. M. Danielo calls him the "best historian of the thirteenth century;" to which measure of praise we can scarcely subscribe.

---

[1] In all fifteen, says the preamble of the charter, given us in full by M. Danielo.

"A certain professor of Paris endowed with great genius and a strong memory, having for two years taught the *Arts*, that is the *Humanities*, with great success, directed his attention to theology, in which he made such progress in a short time, that he soon filled with distinction the chair of that faculty. He taught with great ability, and disputed with still greater subtlety. His pleasure consisted in handling difficult questions hitherto unheard of, and in resolving and explaining them with elegance and clearness. He had as many hearers as the largest palace could contain. One day, having discoursed very subtly of the Trinity, and having brought forward the most profound reasons for this dogma, he was obliged to defer the conclusion of the argument until the following day. All the students of theology in the city were advised of this; and, being eager to hear the solution of so many apparently inexplicable questions, they crowded to his famous school in mass. The professor, taking his seat, began by stating in order all the questions he had hitherto treated; and those which seemed to every body unfathomable, he explained with so much clearness, elegance, and orthodoxy, that all his hearers were in amazement.

"After this wonderful explanation, those of his disciples who were most familiar with him, and most eager for instruction, begged him to repeat his questions and answers, that they might be able to take a copy of them under his dictation; representing to him, that it would be an indignity, as well as an irreparable loss, to suffer the light of so much science to be extinguished. But he, inflated with pride, raised his eyes to heaven, and with an insolent laugh, exclaimed: 'O Jesule! Jesule! Little Jesus! Little Jesus!! How much have I confirmed and exalted thy law in this dispute! But with how much stronger reasons could I not abase, weaken, and destroy it, should I wish to be malicious, and take the matter to heart!' Having said this, his tongue failed, and he remained without speech. Not only he became mute, but an idiot, and radically stupid. He did not teach or discourse any more; he became the laughing stock of all who were acquainted with the fact. Two hours afterwards, he was not able to distinguish the letters of the alphabet. But the divine vengeance which weighed on him having become a little mitigated, his son, by dint of repetition, succeeded in teaching him the *Pater Noster*, and the *Credo*, which he learned by heart, and repeated stammering: but this was all. This miracle confounded the arrogance, and repressed the boasting, of many among the scholars and professors. This fact," concludes the historian, "was witnessed by Nicholas Duffy, who was afterwards Bishop of Dublin, a man of great authority, who stated it to me, and requested that I should relate it, that it might not be forgotten by posterity."[1]

We will conclude this paper, by briefly adverting to some of the distinguishing characteristics of Schools and Universities in the middle ages.

---

[1] Matthew Paris, Historia Maj. Angliæ, ad an. 1201. See also Bulæus Hist. Universit. Paris. Tom. III. p. 8. Another Historian, Thomas de Cantimpre, likewise a cotemporary, substantially confirms the statement of Matthew Paris. He states that the blasphemy of Simon consisted in comparing Jesus Christ with Moses and Mohammed. (Bulæus, ibid. p. 9.)

These may be reduced to three: 1. their erection was prompted by religion and charity; 2. they were generally *free*, and all could frequent them without expense; and, 3. without excluding mere human learning, they yet attached far greater importance to sacred studies. We have recognized many of these features in the facts already alleged; but some additional illustrations may not be wholly useless or devoid of interest.

1. Nothing is more certain, than that religion presided over the erection of those splendid institutions of learning. No other motive could have caused the raising up of so many brilliant literary establishments. Whoever has studied the history of those ages of faith, must have observed, that religion and divine charity were then the most powerful stimulants to exertion. All other motives were comparatively powerless. To rear institutions, where the poor — the favorite members of Jesus Christ — might imbibe literature hallowed by religion; to cause souls redeemed by the blood of Christ to be trained to virtue and learning; — this was then deemed the noblest use to which money could be applied. The founders of those Schools did not court human applause; it was glory enough for them, if in the eyes of heaven "they could shine like stars forever;" or if, in consideration of their pious bequests for education, God would vouchsafe in His mercy to blot out their sins. "We wish," says St. Benedict, the founder of the illustrious order which bears his name, "to institute a School *for the service of the Lord*, and we hope that we have not placed anything sharp or painful in this institution.[1]

Beraudiere, bishop of Perigueaux, founded a seminary for poor scholars in his own city, and stated in dying, that he had left to posterity his book, his church rebuilt, and this seminary for the poor. "May gracious heaven grant," he adds, "that posterity may receive great utility; and may God vouchsafe pardon for my past sins!"[2]

The child's advancement in virtue was then the greatest object of the parent's solicitude. Eginhard writes to his son, who was at the School of Fulda: "But above all, learn to imitate those good morals in which he (your teacher) excels; for grammar and rhetoric and all other studies of liberal arts are vain, and greatly injurious to the servants of God, unless by the divine grace they know how to be subject to virtue; for 'science puffeth up, but charity edifieth.' I would rather see you dead than abounding in vice." St. Anselm of Canterbury, employed similar language, in writing to his nephew Anselm.[3] The school rooms of the monasteries at Rome and Bologna, were sanctuaries of piety; the student always beheld in them an image of that immaculate Virgin, who was ever the patroness of Christian scholars. In fine, not to multiply facts, whoever will study the history of those Schools, will not fail to remark that religion always prompted their erection, and presided over their destinies. Every exercise was commenced and terminated by prayer.[4]

---

[1] Præf ad Regulam—*in fine*.

[2] Gouget. xvi. 13. apud Digby, Vol. 2, p. 134.

[3] St. Anselmi Opp. Lib. 4, Epist. 31.

[4] For these beautiful prayers recited before and after the scholastic exercises, see Digby Vol. ii, pp. 123 and 135.

2. Instruction in most of those Schools was wholly gratuitous. This was particularly true of the seminaries of Rome, and of almost all the cathedral, parochial, and monastic Schools, erected by order of ecclesiastical councils. This beautiful feature in education during the middle ages was a necessary consequence of the spirit of Christian charity, which then prevailed, and which, as we have just seen, was the main spring of literary exertion. Teachers in those days wished for no emoluments, but the smiling approval of God! Bishops, kings, and emperors left immense legacies for the gratuitous education of the poor. Leopold, Arch-duke of Austria, employed his wealth in founding numerous seminaries of learning, which he committed to the charge of pious and learned monks. Pope Urban V. supported more than a thousand students at different academies, supplying them also with books. The celibacy of the clergy did more for the erection of Schools for the poor, than perhaps anything else. Clergymen whose income exceeded their expenses, felt bound by the spirit, if not by the letter of the canon law, to appropriate the surplus to charitable purposes, among which the principal was the founding of hospitals and Schools. The forty-four Colleges attached to the University of Paris were most of them founded by clergymen, prompted thereto by religious and charitable motives.

The greatest boast of this age is the founding of common and free Schools. Catholicity was the real foundress of such institutions. Money is now necessary for every thing—it is the great, almost the only motive of action. Teachers will not labor without remuneration. Free Schools cannot be established now, unless the community be heavily taxed for their support. It was not so in the good old Catholic times. Christian charity was a coin which then circulated freely, supplying the place of money. Alas! Charity hath grown cold! Even the poor must now be supported by taxation! Alas! for the spirit of the ages of faith!

3. Many Protestant writers have asserted, that nothing but scholastic philosophy and theology was taught in the Schools and Universities of the middle ages. No assertion could be more unfounded. True, those sciences which spoke of heavenly things and of God, were more warmly cherished; but mere human learning was not neglected. The great Alcuin wrote to Charlemagne, from Tours, where he was teaching: "According to your exhortations and good desire, I apply myself to minister to some, under the roof of St. Martin, the honey of the holy scriptures. Others I endeavor to inebriate with the old wine of *ancient learning;* others I begin to nourish with the apples of grammatical subtlety. Some I try to illuminate in the science of the stars, as if of the painted canopy of some great house; I am made many things to many persons, that I may edify as many as possible, to the advantage of the holy Church of God, and to the honor of our imperial kingdom." Roger Bacon applied successfully to the study of the practical sciences; and in the thirteenth century he made many brilliant discoveries, which would do honor to this age. Albertus Magnus wrote an extensive treatise on natural history, in which he

embodied all that was valuable in the works of Aristotle and Pliny, adding many discoveries of his own. These are a few out of a hundred examples that might be alleged, to prove that human science was cultivated in the "Dark" ages. In all the Universities, mathematics and physics were taught, as well as metaphysics and theology.

How advantageously do not the ancient Catholic Universities compare with those of later date and of Protestant origin! Look, for example, at the boasted Universities of Germany. Drinking, smoking, duelling, and secret associations are there the order of the day. Morality is banished from them, and the ardor of study is greatly abated.[1]

---

[1] See an able article on this subject in the North American Review for April, 1842,—a Review of a late work on the German Universities.

VII. INFLUENCE OF CATHOLICITY ON CIVIL LIBERTY.

Terms defined—What is liberty?—Which is the best form of government?—Direct and indirect influence—Tendency of Christian teaching—Division of the subject—Theoretical view—Equalizing the social condition—Form of Church government—A happy blending of different elements—The elective principle—Deliberative assemblies—Authority of the Pope—Practical influence of the Church—In the early ages—In the middle ages—Rescuing Europe from barbarism—Means employed for humanizing society—Two Protestant testimonies—Slavery and the serf system—Struggle between the Cross and the Crescent—The Crusades—Their influence on the social condition—The Free Cities—In Spain—In Germany—And in Italy—Lombard League—Italian Republics—Guelphs and Ghibellines—The deposing power—Republics of San Marino and Andorra—The monastic institute—Teaching of mediæval theologians—*Magna Charta*—William Wallace. Robert Bruce, and William Tell—Influence of the reformation on liberty—In Germany—And in England—Catholic patriots during the American revolution—Conclusion.

THIS subject should be approached with clear ideas on its nature, as well as with certain fixed principles to guide us in our investigation. These principles are contained in the title placed above, as in a germ, and we cannot, perhaps, better introduce this paper, than by a brief definition of the words of which it is composed.

Liberty, especially with its qualification, *civil*, is not an absolute, but a relative term. It has no fixed nor determinate meaning, whether we regard its etymology or its general acceptation among mankind. It implies, in general, *some* exemption from external restraint; but the amount of this exemption, as well as the *quantum* of restraint compatible with liberty, can be determined by no absolute standard. What is called liberty in one age, and under one set of circumstances, would be called slavery in another, and in a new order of things. Two extreme cases are, however, excluded by the meaning generally attached to the term: that of complete external restraint, which we call slavery, and that of no restraint whatever, either on person or action; which latter, though it may be thought to exist in the untrammeled savage of the forest, never has existed *de facto*, and in the nature of things never can exist, in any well organized civil society. Between these two extremes, the meaning of the term varies according to times, persons, and circumstances.

The very idea of government implies some restraint on individual liberty. The compact, express or implied, between the governor and the governed, necessarily supposes some sacrifice of personal freedom on the part of the latter for the general good of the body politic. The extent of this sacrifice must be determined by the character of the people to be governed, and by reflection on the great end of all civil governments, which is to secure to the governed, the possession of life, honor and property. And without venturing to pronounce definitely on a question, which has been so long agitated among the most civilized nations of the earth, we may safely say, that the form of government, which combines the proper security of these great objects with the greatest amount of personal freedom, is the best in theory as well as in practice. In accordance with this principle, there can be no doubt, that, whenever the character of the people can bear it, a well regulated democracy is preferable to all other forms of government. But while a predilection for our own cherished institutions is thus founded on reasoning from first principles, the liberal mind will not be led into the vulgar error of condemning too harshly every other form of civil polity. Each may be good in its place, and in reference to the people for whom it is appointed. Governments, like garments, must suit the persons for whom they are designed.

When we speak of the *influence* of Catholicity on civil liberty, we are not to be understood as implying that this influence is always direct, or that it is a primary object of our holy religion. Christ did not come to decide the complicated problems of human governments; His mission had a higher, — a holier purpose. He came not to pronounce on the political differences existing among mankind, but to establish a divine system, —a kingdom not of this world, — into which all were admissible, no matter under what form of government Providence might have cast their lot. One cannot be a good Christian without being a good citizen; and all that our blessed Saviour is recorded to have said on this subject, is that remarkable answer of his to the Scribes and Pharisees: "Render, therefore, unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."[1]

But if Christianity was not intended to have a direct, it at least has had a most powerful indirect influence on civil governments. By elevating and ennobling man's nature,— by dissipating the errors of his mind, and expanding the affections of his heart, it has necessarily promoted even his earthly happiness, and improved his social condition. By slow, but steady degrees, it has broken the fetters of the slave and of the captive, and prepared mankind for full and perfect liberty. The emancipation of the mind and heart from the slavery of error and sin, was a primary object of the Christian religion, expressed in those words of Christ: "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."[2] This higher freedom once secured, man was naturally led to break other bonds. Christianity thus threw upon earthly things a light reflected from heaven, and pointed triumphantly to the great "City of God," as more than realizing all the brightest visions of human freedom and happiness!

The influence of Catholicity on civil liberty may be viewed in a twofold light: the one theoretical, the other practical. The former is that of her doctrines and government; the latter, that of her external action on society. We will endeavor to show that, under both aspects, this influence has been favorable to the development of free principles, and to the progress of civil liberty.

---

[1] St. Matt. xxii.

[2] St. John viii, 32.

1. Though the divine Founder of the Christian Church did not intend to interfere with civil governments, yet the tendency of his doctrines was to equalize the social condition of mankind,—to exalt the humble, and to humble the proud. His was a religion which solaced and raised up the poor; and taught those in power to bear their honors meekly, and to remember that all Christians are equal before God, with whom "there is no exception of persons." The Church founded by Christ has ever been guided by these principles. She has always proclaimed the truth, that all mankind were born alike "children of wrath,"[1] and that by baptism they all become equally "children of God." With her "there is neither gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free; but, Christ is all, and in all."[2] The prince and the beggar,—the princess and the poorest peasant girl,—kneel side by side in her most stately temples, all reduced to the same level of humble suppliants for mercy! The pew system, which establishes distinctions in churches, is a modern invention unknown to Catholic times, and still unknown in Catholic countries. St. Peter's church, with pews, would present a spectacle, blending strangely the sublime and the ridiculous. It would be something like the Englishman's project, to have the front of that magnificent temple painted and penciled in the modern style! In this, and in every other respect, the Church has fully carried out the intentions of her divine Founder; she has ever been the mother of the poor, and the comfortress of the afflicted. Christ neglected the rich and mingled freely with the poor; she has caught His spirit, and, in every age, has imitated His example; as we trust to show in the sequel.

The analogy of these principles with those embodied in our Declaration of Independence, must be manifest to every reflecting mind; while their influence on the social condition could not be otherwise than favorable to the development of free principles, as well as destructive of tyranny. Nor was this tendency neutralized by the form of Church government. It is not necessary to inquire, whether this be monarchical, aristocratical, or democratical, or, a blending of the three. Suffice it to say, that, as its objects are widely different from those of any human government, so its nature is also widely different. To preserve His followers in unity of faith and worship, and to unite them into one compact body, Christ instituted a form of government, the best calculated to secure these ends; and, at the same time, compatible with every condition of human society. These objects are entirely spiritual and supernatural, and the form of government, though external, is accordingly marked by the same qualities. The arms of the Church are not carnal, but spiritual. Her "kingdom is not of this world," and, therefore, cannot be incompatible with any worldly government.

Though we cannot, for the reasons indicated, draw an exact parallel between her form of government and those of civil society, yet, we might be warranted in saying, that the former combines all the excellencies of the latter, without their defects. It is an elective monarchy, an aristocracy of merit, and a democracy without party factions. Every Christian man, no matter how lowly, is eligible to the highest offices in the Church. Many of the Popes have been chosen from the lowest walks of life. The late Pontiff was an example of this. His merit alone raised him from an humble situation in a small village of northern Italy, Belluno, to the highest honors of the hierarchy. And, as an illustration of this same principle, we may remark here, by the way, that of the forty-one Pontiffs, who during the last three hundred years have occupied the chair of St. Peter, only five have been Roman citizens; and that, during the same period, very few Popes have been elected from princely families. The same remark applies to the body of cardinals, who in general receive their honors solely as the award of merit and learning. Nor do the four or five, out of seventy, selected from noble families, form an exception to this remark. Not to speak of others, every one has heard of the eminent virtues and transcendant merit of the late sainted Cardinal Odescalchi.

---

[1] Ephes. ii, 3.

[2] Coloss. iii, 11.

The elective principle, differently modified according to circumstances, has also been applied in every age of the Church to the second great order of the hierarchy, the bishops. In Catholic countries, where the requirements of the canon law can be complied with, they are usually elected by the clergy or chapter, according to certain established forms. In this country, and in some others, the election, or rather presentation of candidates, is made by the bishops of the metropolitan province, in accordance with a canon of the great Nicene council, held in 325. If the approval and action of the holy see are necessary, before any election can take effect, it is to secure unity of government, and to prevent the intrusion of unworthy members into the hierarchy. So far was this elective principle carried during the first ages of the Church, that, in many cases, the people had a voice with the clergy in the election of their bishops; more, however, it must be confessed, as witnesses of the qualities of the candidate, than as regular electors. Thus we read, that St. Ambrose and St. Augustine were chosen bishops by the clergy and people of Milan and Hippo. Factions and other inconveniences attending this mode of election caused its gradual abolition, and the substitution of other safer forms; but the spirit and practice of the Church have nevertheless always inclined her, in the election of bishops, to consider not only the qualities of the candidate, but also how far he might prove acceptable to the flock to be committed to his charge.

Another essential feature of democracy, is the decision of all matters of importance in deliberative assemblies. The Church has exhibited this feature as strikingly as any republic; and she has presented the oldest and best models of such assemblies. From the councils held by the apostles, mentioned in the Acts, down to that of Trent, in the sixteenth century, she has constantly applied this principle, in regard both to the decision of controversies on doctrinal points, and to statutes of discipline. Not only does it pervade her whole history, but it ramifies throughout her entire body, spread over the surface of the earth. It is exhibited in diocesan synods, held annually in each diocese, for the regulation of local discipline; in provincial councils held every three years, in accordance with the decree of the Tridentine council; in national councils held at stated intervals, for the regulation of national discipline; and in general councils, which meet only during the greatest emergencies of the Church. That the disciplinary statutes of all these various deliberative assemblies may be in harmony with the general laws of the Church, they cannot take effect without the approval of the holy see; which in this, as in every other respect, is thus an effective center of unity, and the great conservative principle of the Church.

It has been said, that the authority of the Pope is absolute and despotic. No charge could be more unfounded. It is true, that he derives his authority immediately from Christ, who gave to him, in the person of Peter, full power to feed the sheep as well as the lambs of His entire flock (John xxi). It is true, also, that this power is ample enough to meet every emergency that may arise. But it is equally true, that it is necessarily limited by its own nature, and by the objects it was instituted to promote. It can do every thing, in its own appropriate sphere, and for the edification of the body of Christ;—out of its own province, and for destruction, it is powerless. The exercise of the pontifical power is variously restrained by the decrees of general councils, the enactments of the canon law, and the force of precedent. Whatever opinion may be entertained about the theory, the practice of papal authority has ever been regulated by these fixed principles. The wisdom and consistency of the court of Rome, and its rigid adherence to precedent, not only in the substance, but also as to the very form of its decisions, are well known to the world. Even Protestants with the most violent prejudices have been forcibly struck by this fact, and sadly puzzled to account for it to their own satisfaction. The Pope usually decides nothing without consulting his counselors, the college of cardinals, and seldom determines any thing against their advice. Though the cases are not in every respect parallel, yet in viewing the manner of procedure adopted by the Roman Court, we are forcibly reminded of our President and Senate. The congregations, or committees of cardinals for various purposes, correspond to the standing committees of the Senate; and in the former matters are discussed with as much patience and ability, to say the least, as in the latter.

II. But, as theories, however specious, might be thought to mislead us, we come at once to what must be deemed decisive in the matter,—the *practical* influence of Catholicity upon civil liberty. And, a mere glance at the different epochs of Church History, in connection with the corresponding phases of society, will suffice to show us, what that influence has been, how it has promoted civilization, and, at least indirectly, developed the democratic principle.

1. The Church was so trammeled and oppressed by the Roman government, during the first three centuries of her existence, that her influence on society during that period could neither be fully exerted, nor extensively felt. Still, though crushed and bleeding, she spoke with a voice

which raised up and comforted the poor and the persecuted, and either softened the heart or struck terror into the bosom of the persecutor. In the second century, Tertullian could already appeal to the immense number of Christians in every part of the empire, as an argument to prove the utter impotency of tyranny, and as a powerful inducement to stay the arm of persecution. The vast body of early Christians were from the lowest walks of life; these were exalted by the Christian profession; and there is no doubt that the social condition of this order in the fourth century, when Christianity finally gained the ascendency, was vastly more elevated than it had been under the old Roman empire. Immense numbers of slaves had been emancipated, and the higher orders of society had already learned to look on the hitherto despised lower classes as their equals in Christ Jesus. In the fourth century, we find the Church employing her newly acquired influence on civil society, for the mitigation of despotism, and the vindication of the oppressed. At Milan, we behold an Ambrose refusing communion to the great Theodosius, who, in an evil hour, had ordered a massacre of his people in the streets of Thessalonica, without distinction of guilty and innocent. This stain of blood was washed out only by a public penance, such as the lowest member of the Church would have been constrained to undergo for a similar offence. In the east, we see a Chrysostom rebuking, with all his burning eloquence, the vices of an empress; and, though his life was the forfeit of his courage, his blood still cried aloud against vice in high places, and *the people* raised a monument to his memory! We say nothing of an Athanasius, of a Hilary, and of various Roman Pontiffs, who, during the fierce days of Arianism, had the courage to suffer for the faith, and to tell the truth to those emperors, who, before their conversion to Christianity, had been worshiped as gods, but were now to be taught, that they were but weak, erring men.

2. When the Roman empire fell, and the successive hordes of the heathen or Arian Northmen overran Europe, for more than two centuries spreading desolation in their course, the Church alone saved the world from barbarism. Like the ark of old, she rode triumphant amid this second deluge of waters, bearing in her bosom the sacred seeds of civilization; which, when those dark waters should subside, she was again to scatter broadcast on the surface of the earth. Not only this, but she was to water them with her tears and her blood, was to cherish their growth, and to gather the abundant fruit they would yield, "for the healing of the nations." From the fifth to the tenth century, she successfully labored for the conversion of the Northmen, and during this period she had the consolation of seeing them enter, nation by nation, within her pale. Meantime she sought by various means to soften their fierceness, to improve their legislation, and to diminish the evils of the feudal system, which they had brought into Europe. The bloody strifes which this system occasioned, were mitigated by the famous "Truce of God;" which enacted, that out of reverence to the Lord's passion and resurrection, all hostilities should be suspended from the evening of Wednesday to the morning of

the following Monday.[1] She gradually abolished the absurd and superstitious ordeals by fire and water, and substituted for them more rational forms of trial. She raised her voice against the cruel sacrifice of life in the joust and tournament, by enacting a severe canon against such pageants.[2]

To shield the oppressed, and to protect the persecuted in those days of bloody feuds, she established the privilege of asylum, and declared, that whoever sought refuge near the altar of God should be free from the attacks of every enemy. In one word, she did all that was possible under the circumstances, to ameliorate the social condition of mankind; and if she did not fully succeed according to her wishes, it was not "her fault," but "that of the times." Though, amidst the din of arms and the confusion of society, her voice was not always heard, yet when heard it was generally respected. In fact, hers was the only authority that was generally reverenced during the period in question; and if she had not interposed it, no human power could have saved Europe from complete barbarism. By averting this overwhelming evil, she made it *possible* for Europe to be free; and this argument alone would prove that all the subsequent advancement of Europe in civilization and in liberal government, is to be ascribed to *her* influence, as to its source.

As an able American Protestant writer candidly acknowledges:

> "Though seemingly enslaved, the Church was in reality the life of Europe. She was the refuge of the distressed, the friend of the slave, the helper of the injured, the only hope of learning. To her, chivalry owed its noble aspirations; to her, art and agriculture looked for every improvement. The ruler from her learned some rude justice; the ruled learned faith and obedience. Let us not cling to the superstition, which teaches that the Church has always upheld the cause of tyrants. Through the middle ages she was the only friend and advocate of the people, and of the rights of man. To her influence was it owing that, through all that strange era, the slaves of Europe were better protected by law than are now the free blacks of the United States by the national statutes."[3]

Another Protestant writer gives the following opinion of the influence which the Catholic Church exercised on civilization, especially during the middle ages:

> "A desire of corporate security, and a vague notion of an imperial majesty, an absolute and sacred power vested in an individual, were the bequests of ancient times to the middle ages. Christianity, or rather reverence for the Church, was the most powerfully formative opinion of modern civilization, and here it is especially necessary to distinguish between the institution and the ideas on which it was founded. The antiquities of clerical organization need not now be investigated; it is sufficient to say, that the Christian Church, before it was established by Constantine, had a fixed system of government with a due subordination of parts, and that, when Christianity became the established religion of the

---

[1] For a beautiful explanation and illustration of this regulation, see Dr. Wiseman's Lectures on the Holy Week, delivered at Rome.

[2] See Can. xx. of the third Lateran council, held A. D. 1179, under Alexander III.

[3] North American Review, for July, 1845.

empire, the clergy at the same moment became an organized and recognized political body. In the decay of municipal institutions, the bishops and priests succeeded to the influence of the civic magistrates, not by usurpation, but by the sheer pressure of circumstances, possessing the additional advantages of irresponsibility—for their offices were deemed sacred and inalienable. From the fifth to the ninth century, the barbarian elements of force and violent movement were predominant, because horde followed horde, as wave follows wave, and one race of the conquerors had scarcely established itself in a country, when it was forced to make room for another. But amid all these changes and convulsions, the Church remained firm and unshaken; like a gallant vessel in the stormy ocean, it rode proudly over the billows, and, though it sometimes bowed before a sudden burst of the tempest, it instantly rose again in all its pride and all its security.

"The Church was the first permanent establishment of modern Europe; for four centuries it alone maintained the struggle against barbarism: it preserved the memory of municipal freedom and Roman majesty in temporal government, and actually established the system in spiritual affairs; and, by working on ignorance, superstition, and barbarity, by means too closely adapted to the materials of the operation, it obtained a mastery over the energies of the northern tribes, and not unfrequently the guidance and direction of their movements. Such a power was legitimated not merely by continuance but by its usefulnesss, and from the Church, temporal authority was almost at the outset forced to borrow its sanctions and derive its legitimacy.

"It is needless to describe feudality, or point out its inherent tyranny and injustice: but that it was necessary in its age is indisputably proved by its universal adoption in every European country nearly at the same time; the first consequence of the system was a transfer of the influence of the towns to the country, and the almost total extinction of municipal institutions, the last relic of ancient civilization. It was apparently a retrogradation to anarchy; it was subversive of all social security and happiness; but it fostered the growth of individual prowess. The chivalrous virtues, such as they were, sprung from feudalism; the chivalrous literature, by which these virtues were exaggerated and the accompanying vices concealed, was the child of the same parent, and for many centuries has thrown a bright veil over the horrors of its origin. Feudalism was the worst foe to social order, because it was equally opposed to the sovereignty of the monarch and the liberty of the people. Could it have held its position, Europe must have sunk into barbarism; but it had to oppose a powerful principle,—the influence of the Church. In the eleventh century the papacy fought the battle of freedom and civilization.

"It was under the pressure of the feudal system that the organization of the papacy was completed and defined; there is no part of the Romish creed, not one of the Romish institutions, that was not of the utmost importance in the great struggle it had to maintain: and of the doctrines and practices on which the nineteenth century passes just sentence of condemnation (!) there is scarcely one that could have been spared seven hundred years ago, without imminent peril to the great cause of human civilization and social happiness. By its numerous gradations of rank, the Church of the middle ages linked itself to every class of society; its bishops were the companions of princes; its priests claimed reverence in the baronial hall; its preaching friars and monks brought consolation to the cottage of the suffering peasant. When the distinction of caste was rigidly established in every other form of social life, the Church scarcely knew any aristocracy but that of talent; once received into holy orders, the serf lost all traces of his bondage; he was not merely raised to an equality with his former lord, but he might aspire to dignities that cast those of temporal princes into the shade.

"Before we pass sentence on an institution, we should examine the opinion on which it is founded; and before we judge of the opinion, we should know the circumstances by which it was engendered. The public opinion of Europe in the eleventh century was represented by a truly great man, Hildebrand, or, as he was called after his accession to the chair of St. Peter, Gregory VII. It has been the fashion to describe this prelate as a species of moral monster, the enemy of all improvement. There is no doubt that a Pope possessing anything like his influence, who would propose and strive to enforce, the same measures in the nineteenth century that Gregory did in the eleventh, might justly be regarded as one of the worst despots that ever existed, and furthermore as one of the most blundering tyrants that ever disgraced humanity; there is just as little, indeed rather less doubt, that in his own age every one of these measures counteracted some evil principle, and helped to work out an antagonizing principle of civilization. Gregory VII. was a reformer as well as Luther,[1] he used despotic means, but there were no others at his disposal; he was nearly in the ecclesiastical world what Charlamagne and Peter the Great have been in the political; he wished to reform the Church and by means of the Church to reform civil society, to introduce into both more morality, justice, and order; he did not live to see the triumph of his principles, but he prepared the way for the rule of his successors. The theory of Hildebrand's system was beautiful; it apparently based supreme power upon intelligence, and concentrated both in the Church."[2]

3. The influence of the Church had already done much towards mitigating, and gradually destroying that odious feature, common to every form of ancient pagan society,—domestic slavery; by which the vast body of mankind had been held in bondage to a few who alone could claim the right of citizenship.[3] She now set about abolishing that form of slavery which had been introduced by the Northmen, and which was intimately blended with the feudal system. Under this polity, the vast body of the people were called serfs, and could be bought and sold with the soil to which they were attached. With this abject class, the Church sympathized most deeply. Like her divine Founder, she has ever viewed the poor as her favored children. But, in this as in every thing else, she proceeded slowly and cautiously, knowing that every great beneficial change, designed to affect whole masses of population, must be the work of time. Without violence — without any sudden shock of the social system — she slowly, but surely effected her object, and serfism was gradually abolished, wherever her voice could be heard. Under the influence of her humanizing principles and mild legislation, the condition of the serfs was gradually improved; until, the way having been thus wisely prepared, the system disappeared altogether from European society. To show that the social elevation and subsequent emancipation of the serfs were mainly

---

[1] Every reader of history will know how to draw the line of distinction between Luther and Gregory VII.; Luther *reformed* from high to low, Gregory, from low to high.

[2] The Foreign Quarterly Review.

[3] See, for a full development of this interesting topic, Balmes "Catholicity and Protestantism Compared," Ch. xv, and following.

due to the Catholic Church, a very striking fact may be alleged. The only country in Europe where the serf system still exists in all its debasement, is Russia; which, long torn by schism from the Catholic Church, has always resisted her influence in this respect, with as much blind obstinancy as she has done in the matter of the Gregorian calendar.[1]

4. After having thus rescued Europe from barbarism and domestic servitude, the Church was destined to save her from a still more appalling evil,— the subversion of her independence by a foreign religioso-political despotism. The followers of Mohammed, after having overrun Asia and Africa, entered and subdued Spain in the year 711. In 732, their victorious armies had penetrated to the very heart of France; and, though in the famous battle of Tours, fought in this year, Charles Martel, with his French troops, utterly discomfited them, yet their spirit of conquest was not broken by the overwhelming defeat. Recovering from its effects, they became masters of the Mediterranean sea in the tenth century; and they had already established a piratical colony in the south of France, and had twice ravaged Rome itself, before the year 906.[2] They subdued Sicily, and other important islands in the Mediterranean; and Spain being already in their possession, they threatened Constantinople in the east, while the whole southern frontier of Europe was open to their incursions. Europe, thus menaced with a foreign yoke, which already weighed heavily on the necks of half the world, was in no condition to repel invasion. Broken into fragments by the feudal system, and torn by petty wars, she could not expect to cope with the immense united host embattled against her under the crescent.

In this emergency, the Church and the Popes came to the rescue; and whoever will read history aright, must see that it is mainly to their influence that Europe is indebted for her independence, and with it, for all her social advantages over other countries. That master stroke of policy, which, by means of the Crusades, carried the war into the enemy's country, and for two centuries made Palestine the battle ground of the world, kept off the threatened invasion, and preserved Constantinople, the great bulwark of Europe in the East, for centuries; and, while it gave the Mohammedans enough to do at home, it allowed Europe time to breathe, and to prepare for the coming struggle. And yet, with all this preparation for the final contest, Europe still proved almost unequal to it, after the Turks had taken Constantinople, in 1453. For more than two centuries after this event, not only her peace, but her very independence, was threatened by the Turks. The Popes were always at the head of the league for repelling Turkish invasion; and the glorious result of the famous sea-fight at Lepanto in 1571, which destroyed the Turkish fleet, and drove the

---

[1] For a full and satisfactory account of the present moral, social and religious condition of Russia, see De Maistre, "Du Pape," vol. ii, where he enters into this subject at length. Even Voltaire, that implacable enemy of the Popes, awards them much praise for their agency in mitigating and abolishing the serf system; though here, as elsewhere, his quotations are not always reliable. Essai sur les Mœurs, Ch. lxxxiii.

[2] See Muratori, "Annali di Italia," ad an. 906, etc. Also Hallam's Middle Ages, Ch. i, p. 25.

Ottoman flag from the Mediterranean, is mainly to be ascribed to the exertions of the sainted Pope Pius V. As late as 1683, the Turkish army was under the walls of Vienna, and that city was saved only by the timely appearance of Sobieski and his thirty thousand brave Poles, invited to the rescue by Pope Innocent XI.

5. But the Crusades did more than to secure the independence of Europe. To them, more perhaps than to any other cause, are we to attribute the social improvement of mankind, and the rise of free institutions. They united Europe in one great cause, they impaired the feudal system and consolidated government, they rid Europe of many petty despots who were firebrands in the heart of society; they elicited enterprise, stimulated commerce, fostered industry, and cherished mechanical skill, by opening a market in the east to the products of European industry. Many of our greatest inventions, and among them, that of gunpowder and the mariner's compass, date back to the period of the Crusades. But what is still more to our present purpose, they raised the lower classes, and gave importance to the cities. The Free Cities of the middle ages,—those first nurseries of free principles,—owed their origin and their privileges mainly to the startling events connected with those expeditions. At least, this is true in regard to those of Italy, which during these excursions into Palestine, became the commercial carriers of Europe.

The limits of this essay will allow but a rapid view of the Free Cities of the middle ages; and we will speak chiefly of those of Spain, Germany, and Italy. Of those of France, M. Guizot, a Protestant, treats at length, in his late singular lectures "on Civilization in Modern Europe."[1]

If we except those of Italy, the Cities of Spain, were the first in Europe which received charters of privileges. These they obtained from various Spanish monarchs, for military services rendered, or to be rendered the state, in the long contest with the Moors for national independence. As early as the year 1020, Alfonzo V. granted a charter of rights to the city of Leon. Sancho the Great and Alfonso VI., in the same century, extended similar privileges to many other cities. These charters, or *fueros*, allowed them to elect their own city council, judges and other municipal officers, and to send deputies to the Cortes of the kingdom. We read of many cities sending their deputies to the Cortes in the year 1169. From the reign of Alfonso IX. in 1188, we have constant mention "of a great number of deputies from each city."[2] In the Cortes of Burgos, in 1315, there were present one hundred and ninety-two delegates from ninety different cities; and in that of Madrid, in 1391, one hundred and twenty-six deputies attended from fifty cities.[3]

The Spanish monarchs had *no right to levy taxes, without the consent of the people duly represented in the Cortes.*[4] In granting a supply to

---

[1] M. Guizot belongs to that modern school of philosophers, called Eclectics. In discussing history, he takes both sides of almost every question, and in many instances it would require a wizard, or a diplomatist like himself, to define his real position.

[2] In the old Spanish of that day, "*muchedumbre de embiados de cada cibdad.*"

[3] For the original authorities, see Hallam's Middle Ages, chap. iv, p. 200, *et seq.*

[4] Ibid p 208-9.

Henry III. in 1393, the Cortes required, "that he should swear before one of the archbishops, not to take or demand any money, service or loan, or any thing else of the cities or towns, nor of individuals belonging to them, on any pretence of necessity, until the three estates of the kingdom should be duly summoned and assembled in Cortes, according to ancient usage. And if any such letters requiring money have been written, *that they shall be obeyed, but not complied with.*[1] Mr. Hallam admits, that "the civil rights of rich and poor in (Spanish) courts of justice were as equal as in England."[2]

The Church exercised a great and even direct influence in bringing about this development of the democratic principle in Spain. The ecclesiastical councils, and especially those of Toledo, constituted the basis of all Spanish jurisprudence; and the old Spanish civil laws were published in the ecclesiastical collections.[3] The councils of Spain, as of many others countries of Europe, during the middle ages, were often mixed assemblages of bishops, nobles, and deputies from cities; and they often decided on temporal as well as on spiritual matters. This fact is a key to many of the difficulties connected with Church History during that period. The fourth council of Toledo enacts, that "on the death of a king, the princes of the kingdom, together with the clergy, shall elect his successor by common consent.[4]

From all these facts, we gather: first, that Spain, during the middle ages, was in possession of these great democratic principles,—exemption from taxation without the consent of the people, free and full representation of popular interests in the national Cortes, and an elective monarchy, and secondly, that the Church was mainly instrumental in securing to her these precious advantages. Her liberties began to decline in the sixteenth century, under Charles V. and Philip II.; and one great cause of the declension, was the supposed necessity of strong measures of precaution against the civil commotions occasioned by the reformation in other countries of Europe. By the way, it is rather a singular fact, that civil liberty should have declined in every country of Europe in the sixteenth century. Even Guizot admits this.[5]

In Germany, the cities of Worms and Cologne acquired political importance under Henry IV., A. D. 1076. His successor, Henry V., granted enfranchisement to the artisans in various other cities of the Germanic empire. The citizens were classed according to their respective employments.[6] Frederick I. granted a charter to the city of Spire in 1188, and various other German cities began to elect their own municipal officers, and to have a voice in the diet of the empire, after this date. In the thirteenth century, they became more opulent and still more independent. The three orders of electors, princes, and deputies from cities, took their respective places in the diet of Frankfort in 1344. The provincial states of the Germanic empire had also their own privileges, and they managed their own local affairs. The great fundamental principle of mediæval jurisprudence in Germany, was that *"no taxes were to be levied on the people without their own consent."*[1]

---

[1] "Obedecidas, y non cumplidas." In refusing, the Cortes still maintained that lofty style of deference for their sovereigns, which has ever marked the Spanish character.

[2] Ibid. p. 201.

[3] Ibid. 206. See also Guizot's Lectures, etc.

[4] "Defuncto in pace principe primates totius regni una cum sacerdotibus successorem regni communi consilio constituant." See Marina, Teoria de las Cortes, t. ii, p. 2; and Id. Ensayo Politico, etc., chap lxvi; and Hallam ibid. p. 206.

[5] See Guizot's Lectures, p. 300, *et seq.*

[6] See Schmidt, Geschichte, etc., tom. iii, p. 239 *et seq.* quoted by Hallam, chap. iv, p. 233-9.

In Italy, as we have already intimated, the Free Cities obtained importance during the Crusades, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The Popes were their principal protectors; while the emperors of Germany viewed their growing liberties with an evil eye. In a diet held at Roncaglia in 1158, Frederick Barbarossa endeavored to wrest from them their privileges, and to subject them to the German yoke. The cities rebelled, but they were soon reduced to subjection by the armies of Frederick, who, to strike terror into the Italian mind, caused the city of Milan to be razed to the ground, in 1162. But he was disappointed in his expectations. The principal cities of Lombardy united in the famous Lombard League, in 1167; and their inhabitants swore that they would either maintain their liberties, or be buried beneath the ruins of their houses. Pope Alexander III. was at the head of this League; and when the decisive battle fought near Legnano, in 1176, had been won by the Italians, the Pope was the principal negotiator on the part of Italy in the treaty of Venice in 1177, which secured to them their liberties. The grateful people built the city of Alexandria, in honor of their illustrious patron.[2]

In the Free Cities of Italy, the democratic principle was developed more fully than in those of any other part of Europe. They became, in fact, independent and regularly organized republics. Was it because they were more immediately under the influence of the Church, and of the Popes? Certain it is, that the Popes contributed much to their origin, and greatly fostered their growth. Under *their* auspices, Venice, Genoa, Florence, Pisa, Sienna, Brescia, Bergamo, and Milan became a bright galaxy of free governments. And though their light was subsequently obscured by the clouds of faction, yet most of them continued to shine throughout the middle ages; and two of them, Genoa and Venice, lingered above the horizon, though with diminished lustre, almost until our own day.

6. The fierce and bloody factions of the Guelphs and Ghibellines contributed, perhaps more than any other cause, to mar the prosperity of Italy, during the period of which we are speaking. To them chiefly, are we to ascribe the decline and downfall of many of the Italian republics. These factions originated in Germany, after the death of the Emperor Henry VI. in 1197. Two aspirants, Philip duke of Swabia, and Otto duke of Saxony and Bavaria, maintained a long and bloody contest for the imperial crown. The former belonged to the family of the Ghibellini;

---

[1] See Hallam, ibid.

[2] See Hallam's Middle Ages, chap. iii, p. 184-5. Also Muratori, Dissert. 48, Antiq. Medii Ævi.

and the latter to that of the Este-Guelphi. Both families were originally from Italy, where they were still numerous and influential.[1] The contest between them raged even more fiercely, and for a much longer time, in Italy than in Germany itself. In fact, the greatest political misfortunes of Italy, in every age, have arisen from her having been drawn into the vortex of German politics, and having become, against her will, the theater of war for all Europe. These bloody factions continued to disturb her for many centuries. The Guelphs advocated the independence of Italy; the Ghibellines sought to fasten on the neck of the Italians the imperial yoke of Germany. It was but a renewal of the old contest, which had given rise to the Lombard League, and birth to the Italian republics. During all this protracted struggle, the Popes were found ranged on the side of the Guelphs; and they thus exerted all their influence to promote Italian liberty. Can any one blame them for so doing? What right had Germany to crush Italian liberty? Voltaire himself applauds them for their course,[2] and he says that the destruction of Milan by Frederick Barbarossa would of itself "suffice to justify the Popes for all they did."[3] We may here remark, in general, that the Popes during the middle ages, having been necessarily drawn by the circumstances of the times into European politics, used their influence, almost without an exception, for checking tyranny, and maintaining the rights of the people. And the more we fathom the interesting history of that period, the more shall we become convinced of this great leading fact.

7. This is in nothing more apparent, than in their long struggle with the German emperors;[4] and in the exercise by them of what is called the deposing power. We care not to inquire, whether the Popes had this power in virtue of their sacred office, or merely through the consent and concession of the people and princes themselves, who often invoked it in their behalf. One thing is certain, every exercise of it was a blow aimed at tyranny, and struck for the rights of the people. In deposing a prince, the Pope simply declared, that he had broken his solemn engagement to his people — to govern them in accordance with justice; and that they were in consequence freed from all obligations to him, growing out of their oath of allegiance. The claim of the deposing power necessarily supposed the doctrine of a contract, express or implied, between the king and his people; the former binding himself to protect their rights, and to govern them justly, and the latter, *under this condition only*, pledging to him their allegiance. Every exercise of the power kept this doctrine fresh in the memory of the people, and thereby greatly contributed to the unfolding of the democratic principle. Had the Popes labored in a similar way, to recall to a sense of duty many other despots of that period, the

---

[1] See Muratori, Antiquit. etc., Dissert. 41, for a full account of these "diaboliche fazioni," as he calls them.

[2] Essai sur les Mœurs, tom. i, chap. xxxvii and xlv, and tom. ii, chap. xlvii.

[3] Ibid. tom. ii, chap lxi.—

[4] The Germanic empire was styled the *Holy Roman Empire*. Voltaire (ibid) with his usual caustic wit, and with *unusual* truth, remarks that this was a complete misnomer; — "*it was neither Holy, nor Roman, nor Empire.*"

heart of every patriot would leap with joy. The circumstances which gave rise to this power having ceased, nearly three hundred years since, the claim to it has been abandoned.

8. Of the old Catholic republics, two yet remain, standing monuments of the influence of Catholicity on free institutions. The one is imbosomed in the Pyrennees of Catholic Spain, and the other is perched on the Appenines of Catholic Italy. The very names of Andorra and San Marino are enough to refute the assertion, that Catholicity is opposed to republican governments. Both of these little republics owed their origin *directly* to the Catholic religion. That of Andorra was founded by a Catholic bishop,[1] and that of San Marino, by a Catholic monk, whose name it bears.[2] The bishops of Urgel have been, and are still, the protectors of the former; and the Roman Pontiffs of the latter.[3] Andorra has continued to exist, with few political vicissitudes, for more than a thousand years; while San Marino dates back her history more than fifteen hundred years, and is therefore not only the oldest republic in the world, but perhaps the oldest government in Europe. The former, to a territory of two hundred English square miles, has a population of fifteen thousand; while the latter, with half the population, has a territory of only twenty-one square miles. Both of them are governed by officers

---

[1] A little after the beginning of the ninth century, Louis Le Debonnaire, the successor of Charlemagne, ceded the territory of Andorra to the bishops of Urgel. These exercised a very mild feudal sovereignty over the republic for many centuries; but the real authority was by them permitted to be exercised by two Syndics, or governors, elected by a council of twenty-four members, who were themselves chosen by the people of the six principal towns of the republic. The bishop of Urgel now exercises only a spiritual jurisdiction over Andorra; even the loose authority growing out of the feudal system, having ceased with the last remnant of that system in Europe, more than fifty years since.—See *Malte Brun's Geography*.

[2] Towards the close of the third century, the emperor Diocletian determined to rebuild the city of *Ariminum* or Rimini, which had fallen to ruins. For this purpose, he invited from Dalmatia, his native country, a number of mechanics and architects. His invitation was accepted, and, in the language of the historian of Rimini, (*Clementini*, *Raccolto Historico*, *infra cit.*) "*venne ad Ariminum un gran numero di architetti*, *scalpellini*, *o*, *diciamo tagliapietri*, *e muratori*, *e con essi un' infinita d' operai Schiavoni;*—there came to Ariminum a great number of architects, stonecutters and masons, and with these an infinite number of Schlavonian workmen." Among these was one Marinus, a man of excellent character and a fervent Christian. Rimini was soon restored to more than its ancient glory. But in 303, Diocletian's partiality for this city was turned into hatred, on account of the vast number of Christians who lived within its walls. In the bloody persecution which he raised against the Church, the streets of Rimini "*flowed with rivers of Catholic blood, not to earth but to heaven.*" (Clementini *infra cit.*) Marinus, with the miserable remnant of the slaughtered Christians, fled to the neighboring heights of Monte Titano, where he gave himself up to prayer and penance. His reputation for wisdom and sanctity, as well as similar persecutions, brought great numbers of his countrymen and of Italians to his place of retreat; and thus was laid the foundation of the republic of San Marino, named after its founder, who also gave his name to Monte Titano. Marinus attended a council held at Rimini early in the fourth century; he is styled in its acts *Diaconus*, or deacon. He died in a good old age, towards the close of that century; his body was buried on the mountain, and miracles were said to have been wrought at his tomb. His ashes are now preserved in the church of San Marino, the principal one of the republic, where there is over the high altar a statue of the saint, holding in its hand the figure of a mountain crowned with three towers,—the coat of arms of the republic. (See Clementini; also Matteo Valli, *infra cit.*)

[3] For a full account of the republic of San Marino, see "Dele' Origine e governo della republica di San Marino, di Matteo Valli, secretario e cittadino di esso republica." Padova, 1633. Also "Clementini, Raccolto istorico della fondazione di Rimini," 2 vols. 4to. Rimini, 1617. When Cardinal Alberoni, about a century ago, sought to reduce this little republic under the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, the Pontiff disapproved of his design, and restored to the republic its ancient privileges.

of their own choice; and the government of San Marino in particular, is conducted on the most radically democratic principles.

The legislative body consists of the Council of Sixty, one half of whom at least are, by law, to be chosen from the plebeian order; and of the *Arrengo*, or general assembly, summoned under extraordinary circumstances, in which all the families of the republic are to be represented. The executive is lodged in two *capitanei regyenti*, or governors, chosen every six months, and holding jurisdiction, one in the city of San Marino, and the other in the country; — so jealous are these old republicans of placing power in the hands of one man! The judiciary department is managed by a commissary, who is required by law to be a foreigner, — a native of some other part of Italy, — in order that, in the discharge of his office, he may be biassed by no undue prejudices resulting from family connections.[1] When Addison visited the republic in 1700, he "scarcely met with any in the place who had not a tincture of learning.[2] He also saw the collection of the laws of the republic, published in Latin, in one volume folio, under the title: "Statuta illustrissimæ reipublicæ Sancti Marini." When Napoleon, at the head of his victorious French troops, was in the neighborhood of San Marino, in 1797, he paused, and sent a congratulatory deputation to the republic, "which expressed the reverence felt by her young sister, France, for so ancient and free a commonwealth, and offered, besides an increase of territory, a present of four pieces of artillery." The present was gratefully accepted, but the other tempting offer was wisely declined!

9. The monastic institute, as we have seen, laid the foundations of the republic of San Marino in the fourth century; — it subsequently did more for civil liberty, by furnishing the best models for free institutions. In the beginning of the thirteenth century, arose the two religious orders of St. Francis and St. Dominic, furnishing the Church, as a late eloquent writer[3] has well said, with its two greatest arms of defence, *poverty* and *eloquence*. The forms of government which these men established for their respective orders, contained many elements of democracy. The general of the Franciscans was elected for four years, and that of the Dominicans for six years.[4] The local superiors were also elected for a certain term of years; and in each society rules were made to prevent the too frequent election of the same individual. The monks were ever the friends of the lower

---

[1] An anecdote, current in Italy, will serve to show how justice is administered at San Marino. A merchant of Venice visited the republic to collect a debt from one of its citizens, who had delayed or declined payment. He was conducted to the chief justice, whom he found in a large vat, treading out grapes for wine with his naked feet. He stated his case, without much hope of receiving payment. The justice immediately summoned the delinquent debtor, who acknowledged the debt, but pleaded inability. The indignant judge however immediately decreed, that his house should be sold to meet the demand. To prevent this, the citizen soon produced the amount of the debt, and the Venitian returned home, well satisfied with his journey. Having afterwards witnessed the delays and chicanery of the Venitian courts, he exclaimed: "Vale piu un pistad' uva di San Marino, che dieci parruchoni di Venetia! One grape-trader of San Marino is worth more than ten big-wigs (judges) of Venice!"

[2] See Addison's "Letters from Italy." [3] La Cordaire, "Apology for the Order of St. Dominic."

[4] This, at least, is the rule at present in the Dominican order; originally it was different, the general having been elected for life. The change, however, took place at an early period in the history of the Order; we believe, in the thirteenth century, under St. Raymond de Pennafort, who was general in 1238.

classes, and they did much to elevate their condition in society. Born themselves in general among the poor, and having made a vow of poverty, their sympathies were naturally with the poor. Mingling constantly with the people, and entering into all their wants, their word and example exercised a most humanizing influence on the rude state of society during the middle ages.

10. If any doubt remain as to the favorable influence of Catholicity on civil liberty, it would be dispelled by the express teaching of the theologians, writing in accordance with the principles and the spirit of the Church. Not to extend this paper too much, we will confine ourselves to the authority of the great St. Thomas Aquinas, who, as a theologian, has perhaps had greater weight in the Catholic Church than any other man. His testimony may also show us, what were the general sentiments of the schoolmen in the thirteenth century, when he wrote. Speaking of the origin of civil power and the objects of law, he lays down these principles: "The law, strictly speaking, is directed primarily and principally to the common good: and to decree any thing for the common benefit, *belongs either to the whole body of the people, or to some one acting in their place*."[1] He pronounces the following opinion as to the best form of government: "Wherefore the choice of rulers in any state or kingdom is best, when one is *chosen for his merit to preside over all*, and under him are other rulers *chosen for their merit, and the government belongs to all, because the rulers may be chosen from any class of society, and the choice is made by all*."[2] One would think that he is hearing a democrat of the modern stamp, and yet it is a monk of the dark ages! Many other testimonies of similar import might be cited, but these will suffice.[3]

11. With these principles generally received, and with the other influences noticed above steadily acting on society, we cannot wonder at the rapid development of the democratic principle in the thirteenth and following centuries. Were the Catholic bishops and barons, who wrested *Magna Charta* from the hands of the tyrant John, on the famous plain of Runnymede, in 1215, enemies of civil liberty? And yet, that great charter of English rights, which secured trial by jury, fixed courts, taxation only with the consent of the people, and *habeas corpus*, contained no new provisions; it was but the revival of a charter one hundred and fifty years older, granted by Edward the Confessor, and discovered in the archives of London, by that great champion of English liberty, Cardinal Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury.[4] (See Note A., page 635.)

12. The good old Catholic times produced patriots and heroes, of whom the present age might well be proud. William Wallace, defeated at Buscenneth, fell a martyr to the liberty of his native Scotland in 1305. Robert Bruce achieved what Wallace had bled for not in vain,—the independence of his country. He won, in 1314, the decisive battle of Bannockburn,

---

[1] Summa Theologiæ. 1. 2. 1. Quæst. Art. iii, Resp.

[2] Ibid. Quæst. cv. art. 1.

[3] For a fuller exposition of what the leading Catholic divines have taught on the nature and limits of civil government, see Balmes, sup. cit. ch. xlix. seqq.

[4] See Hurter's "Life of Innocent III," etc. vol ii, p. 686.

which resulted in the expulsion of the English invaders from Scotland. Are the Hungarians, and Poles, and Spaniards, and French, who fought for centuries the battles of European independence against the Saracens and Turks, to be set down as enemies of freedom? Are the brave knights of St. John, who so heroically devoted themselves for the liberty of Europe at Rhodes and at Malta, also to be ranked with the enemies of human rights?

13. Who will stigmatize as lovers of despotism the brave heroes, William Tell, Furst, Werner, and Melchtal, who, at the head of four or five hundred Swiss, fought the battle of Morgarten in 1307, and drove back an invading army of twenty thousand Austrians? And yet these brave men, who laid the foundation of the Swiss Republic, were all Roman Catholics; and in nobly asserting the cause of freedom, they surely did not act in opposition to their principles as Catholics.

14. And still, in the face of all these facts, and of many others which might be alleged, we are to be told that Catholicity is the friend of despotism, and the sworn enemy of republican government! And that, forsooth, all our free institutions are to be ascribed to the Protestant reformation! If this be so, is it not a *little* strange that wherever Protestantism appeared in Europe, and especially wherever it gained the ascendency, the democratic principle was weakened, and the arm of monarchy strengthened? Yet this fact is incontestable. Where now are the liberties of Germany, established by her people, and recognized by her emperors and princes, in the middle ages? What has become of the great democratic principle so generally received during that period, that the people are not to be taxed without their own consent? What has become of the representative system, by which each city and province of the empire had a voice in the general diet? These have all vanished. The fate of Germany is now decided, not by the voice of her once free people, but by the swords and bayonets of her immense standing armies. These constitute the *ultima ratio* assigned by her emperors and kings for any laws they may choose to enact! And it must be confessed that this reason, if not altogether satisfactory, is at least conclusive. Where are now the free cities of Germany, once so famous? Alas! they have dwindled down to two or three, and these shorn of half their honors!

Whence this great change in her social condition? Our vision must be very dull indeed, not to perceive that it occurred in the sixteenth century; and that the revolution, called the reformation, caused it in some places, and occasioned it in others. The political excitement, and the bloody wars to which that revolution gave rise, afforded an excellent opportunity to the German princes to grasp at absolute power. Amidst the agitations of society, they seized on the golden prize thus offered to their ambition, and bore it off triumphantly! And did the Protestants of Germany resist these pretensions? On the contrary they favored them. Though they were clamoring for liberty, and struggling for emancipation from what they were pleased to call a religious despotism, yet they tamely yielded their political rights to the first despot who espoused their cause, and offered to protect them in their religious innovation! They gave themselves up, body and soul,— bound hand and foot,— to a *real* in order to escape an *imaginary* despotism! We confidently appeal to the whole history of that period, to show that this is no exaggeration, and that the picture is not even too highly colored. M. Guizot, a Protestant, and a historian of great weight, expressly asserts "*that the emancipation of the human mind,* (by the reformation) *and absolute monarchy triumphed simultaneously throughout Europe.*[1] And if he had not admitted it, standing monuments would fully attest the fact. Every Protestant kingdom on the continent of Europe has been since the reformation, and is still, an absolute despotism! Every one of them has an established religion, and recognizes in the king absolute power, civil and ecclesiastical! Many of them, as Prussia, for example, are military despotisms, in which every citizen is bound to military service!

The Protestant reformation is directly responsible for all this; for it certainly caused all these political evils, wherever it gained the ascendency. It indirectly occasioned political changes of a similar character in most other countries of Europe. To preserve themselves from the social disturbances, which the reformation had caused wherever it had made its appearance, Catholic princes adopted rigid precautionary measures, and their subjects, under the excitement of the times, willingly resigning a portion of their liberties in order to enable their princes to ward off the threatened evil, the Catholic governments of Europe became, many of them, absolute monarchies. These influences contributed much to produce the effects just named in the Catholic governments of Austria, France, Spain, and Portugal.

In England, the reformation crushed the liberties of the people transmitted to them by their Catholic ancestors, and embodied in the Catholic *Magna Charta.* The tyrant Henry VIII. trampled with impunity on almost every privilege secured by that instrument. Royal prerogative swallowed up every other element of government, both civil and religious. The king was every thing,—supreme in church and state; the parliament and the people were nothing,—a mere cypher. This state of things continued, with the brief and troubled interval of Cromwell, or of the *soi distant* "commonwealth" excepted, until the revolution in 1688,—a period of one hundred and fifty years.

And what did the revolution effect? It did no more than restore to England the provisions of her Catholic *Magna Charta,* which instrument, during the three hundred years preceding the reformation, had been renewed and extended at least thirty times.[1] The glorious revolution indeed!! It did no more than repair the ravages committed by Protestantism on the British constitution during the previous hundred and fifty years, and to restore that constitution to its ancient Catholic integrity. It did not even do this to the fullest extent; for it refused to grant protection and the most unalienable civil privileges to the Catholic body, to whom the British were indebted for the *Magna Charta*, and their glorious constitution. Nor was this body emancipated from political slavery until 1829,—one hundred and forty one years later; and then the act was passed with a bad grace, nor was it full in its measure of justice,—the tithe system and other intolerable evils still remaining unrepealed!

---

[1] Lectures on Civilization in Modern Europe, p. 300, *et seq.* Though he admits this fact, yet he labors, strangely enough, to show that Protestantism emancipated the human mind and originated free institutions! So much for modern eclecticism.

15. We might bring the subject home to our own times and country, and show that the Catholics of the colony of Maryland, were the first to proclaim universal liberty, civil and religious, in North America;[2] that in the war for independence with Protestant England, Catholic France came generously and effectually to our assistance; that Irish and American Catholics fought side by side with their Protestant fellow-citizens in that eventful war;[3] that the Maryland line which bled so freely at Camden with the Catholic Baron De Kalb, while Gates and his Protestant militia were consulting their safety by flight, was composed to a great extent of Catholic soldiers; that there was no Catholic traitor during our revolution; that the one who periled most in signing the Declaration of Independence, and who was the last survivor of that noble band of patriots, was the illustrious Catholic, Charles Carroll of Carrolton; that half the generals and officers of our revolution,—Lafayette, Pulaski, Count de Grasse, Rochambeau, De Kalb, Kosciusko, and many others, were Catholics;—and that the first commodore appointed by Washington to form our infant navy was the Irish Catholic—BARRY. These facts, which are but a few of those which might be adduced, prove conclusively that Catholicity is still, what she was in the middle ages, the steadfast friend of free institutions.[4]

To conclude: Can it be that Catholicity, which saved Europe from barbarism and a foreign Mahommedan despotism,—which in every age has been the advocate of free principles, and the mother of heroes and of republics,—which originated *Magna Charta* and laid the foundation of liberty in every country in Europe,—and which in our own day and country has evinced a similar spirit,—is the enemy of free principles? We must blot out the facts of history, before we can come to any such conclusion! If history is at all to be relied on, we must conclude, that THE INLUENCE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH HAS BEEN FAVORABLE TO CIVIL LIBERTY.

---

[1] See a series of very able articles in the Dublin Review, under the title, "Arbitrary Power, Popery, Protestantism,"—republished in a duodecimo volume by Mr. Fithian; where this and many similar facts are proved by incontestable evidence.—*Dublin Review, Nos.* xv, xviii, xix.

[2] See Bancroft's (Protestant) History of the United States, Vol. i, Colony of Maryland.

[3] See a letter of General Washington to Charles Carroll of Carrolton and Bishop Carroll, written in March, 1790; in which he bears honorable evidence to this fact, alleging it as a reason why Catholics in this country should have equal rights with their Protestant fellow-citizens.

[4] De Tocqueville, a good judge in such matters, says "that the Catholics constitute the most democratic class of citizens in the United States." And to account for this fact, he enters into a course of philosophic reasoning to show that this is a necessary result of Catholic principles.—*Democracy in America*, p. 281: New York edition, 1838.

VIII. AGE OF POPE GREGORY VII.

THE DEPOSING POWER.*

Importance of the subject—Society struggling into form—Hildebrand—His cotemporaries—Historical portraits and parallels—Napoleon's opinion of Gregory VII.—How the Pontiff has been attacked by his enemies—And how defended by Voigt—The great idea of Gregory—His relations to society as its spiritual head—A torrent of abuse stemmed—The question of investitures—Ancient mode of nominating to bishoprics—Contest between the Popes and the emperors of Germany—Papal election—A vital question—St. Peter Damian—His relations to Gregory—Simony and disorder among the clergy—Hildebrand unanimously elected Pope—His earlier career—His experience, coolness, and wisdom—Not exceedingly stern—His wonderful activity—His correspondence—His moral courage—His temporal relations to society—Distracted state of Europe—Princes swearing fealty to the Pope—His protectorate recognized and invoked—Gregory not ambitious—His long struggle with Henry IV.—The Nero of the twelfth century—Otto of Nordheim—Summary of the whole contest—Moderation of Gregory—How and why the Pontiff declared Henry deposed—A stroke for liberty—Opinion of Voigt.

Gregory VII. was the first Roman Pontiff, who ever attempted to depose a temporal prince. Hence his character, as well as that of his age, has awakened much interest and elicited considerable historical inquiry. Men have naturally sought to know why, and under what circumstances, he maintained the claim to a power seemingly so extraordinary in one who was the successor of the poor fisherman of Galilee. We will attempt to throw some light upon this subject, with the aid of M. Voigt, the distinguished biographer of the Pontiff. His testimony will be deemed unexceptionable by the mass of Gregory's opponents; while, based as it is upon original documents, carefully examined, it must have great weight with all impartial men.

The age of Pope Gregory VII., was one of peculiar interest, crowded with great and important events. It was an age of transition. After the civil convulsions which followed the subjugation of Europe by the northmen in the fifth century, society, as if exhausted by over exertion, seems to have settled down into a species of lethargy in the tenth century, reputed by most writers the darkest and most dreary of all the period called the middle ages. The eleventh century presents us the picture of society again struggling into form. To attain this consistency, however, it was necessary for it again to pass through the storm of revolution. Commotions in society are sometimes as necessary for its moral health, as storms are in nature for the purification of the atmosphere.

**Histoire du Pape Gregoire VII. et de son siecle, d'apres les monuments originaux.* Par J. Voigt, profess. a l'universitè de Hall. Traduite de l'Allemand, par M. l'Abbé Jager. Paris, 1838; 2 vol. 8vo. *History of Pope Gregory VII. and of his age, from original documents.* By J. Voigt, Professor at the University of Hall. Translated from the German by the Abbé Jager. Paris, 1838. 2 vols. 8vo.

Whoever will take the trouble to compare the tenth with the twelfth century, must be convinced that, during the intervening period, a great man has passed, and that his passage has been marked by great events. That great man was Hildebrand, afterwards Gregory VII.; and the great events are those which M. Voigt so graphically describes in his history. This embraces the period of thirty-nine years, from the birth of the emperor Henry IV. in 1046, to the death of Gregory in 1085.

M. Voigt could not have chosen a more interesting or important subject, and few could have done it greater justice. His history is not confined to Gregory. Along with him, he portrays the various remarkable personages who flourished at the same time, and with most of whom the Pontiff was thrown into frequent contact. Among these, the chief is Henry IV., of Germany, the exact antithesis of Gregory in all things, *infamous* for every thing for which *he* was *famous*. He and all the others appear before us like finished portraits from a master hand;—their features and form so clearly marked, that they remain fixed in the memory, and will ever afterwards be recognized as old acquaintances.

Great men often appear in groups, like the stars in heaven; and, among the distinguished cotemporaries of Gregory, we may mention St. Peter Damian, St. Anselm, bishop of Lucca, and Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, in Italy, St. Hugh of Cluni, and Cardinal Hugh de Die, in France; Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, and William the Conqueror, in England; and Anno of Cologne, Rodolph, duke of Suabia, and Otto of Nordheim, in Germany. In the south of Italy, the famous Chevalier Robert Guiscard is seen extending the Norman power almost as much as William the Conqueror extends it in England; and the attentive reader will not fail to remark a great similarity in the characters and fortunes of these two fierce, but chivalrous Norman chieftains. He will also detect in the life, position in relation to Henry IV., splendid designs, varied fortunes, and remarkable death of the great Anno, archbishop of Cologne, many traits common to him with the great Cardinal Wolsey of England; though if the comparison be strictly carried out, the palm will, perhaps, be awarded to Anno. Had Henry IV. listened to his counsels, and not been guided too much by the ambitious Adalbert, bishop of Bremen, and by others, the history of the eleventh century would have been very different. If the reader be fond of drawing parallels, he may find many things in the life, character and varied adventures of the great Otto of Nordheim, to remind him of that pink of mediæval chivalry, Richard *Cœur de Lion.*

Finally, in the excellent Empress Agnes, the mother of Henry IV., he will discover the most estimable traits of character; and in the famous Matilda of Tuscany, the particular friend of Gregory, he will find all the qualities which constitute a great and good princess. She combined, in a remarkable degree, the coolness, firmness, and zeal of Gregory, with the warlike talents and impetuous bravery[1] of Otto of Nordheim. All these characters reappear under the pen of M. Voigt, fresh, and, as it were, instinct with life; and it requires but little exertion of fancy, to behold them again acting over before us their respective parts in history, Gregory VII. being the great master spirit and actor, whose influence is felt by them all. Few men, perhaps, have been more differently judged by their cotemporaries, and by posterity, than this illustrious Pontiff. That he was a great man, with transcendent genius, and that he did great things, all readily admit: and Napoleon, an excellent judge of human greatness, showed his discrimination when he said: "If I were not Napoleon, I would wish to be Gregory VII.!" By his enemies, he has been represented as an ambitious man, who aimed at universal dominion, both civil and ecclesiastical, reckless of the means for attaining his object. Some Catholics have thought, that he pushed the claims of his see too far. The Church has erected altars to his memory, as to one of the most devoted champions of her liberty and rights, and one of the greatest promoters of stainless purity among her clergy.

---

[1] See Voigt, (vol. ii, p. 436,) for a curious instance of her skill in arms, when, at the head of her troops, she surprised and defeated Henry's army in Lombardy.

It is a singular stroke of divine Providence, that perhaps the best apology for the course thus pursued by the Church, comes to us from a Protestant pen, and from that Germany too, with which Gregory sustained so long and so arduous a struggle. M. Voigt has defended him, not, as he had been attacked, by mere declamation, but by the evidence of facts drawn from cotemporary writers, such as Lambert, Paul Bernried, Domnizo, Berthold of Constance, Leo Ostiensis, Hermann, Fiorentini, Aventin, Cardinal Arago, and others. He has thoroughly sifted the testimony of these authors, and presented the facts in chronological order, yet woven into a narrative almost as interesting as any work of fiction. Though a Protestant, yet he is so just and moderate, and withal so accurate, that the severe critic, the Abbé Jager, who translated his work into French, found little of importance to correct, and still less to add to the narrative; and besides a remarkably well written, well reasoned, and highly wrought introductory essay of one hundred pages, his notes are chiefly valuable, as exhibiting the original text where the historian had contented himself with a simple reference. The manner of M. Voigt is very similar to that of the great English historian, Lingard, embracing many facts and little theory; while his style, though less terse and condensed, is perhaps more lively, and his narrative more detailed and interesting.

It is not our purpose to write a lengthy review of M. Voigt's work, which we would fain hope soon to see in an English dress. We wish merely to direct attention to the new light, which so unexceptionable a witness has shed upon the character and actions of a man, than whom few have been less known, and more misrepresented.

Gregory had to sustain a two-fold relation to the world: the one spiritual, to the Church, of which he was the visible head; the other temporal, to civil society, in the framework of which he was an important part. Our object is to show, from the facts which M. Voigt alleges and *proves*, that, in both these capacities, his influence was highly beneficial;

while his motives were of the purest and most exalted nature. His great idea was, TO PURIFY THE CHURCH, AND THROUGH ITS AGENCY TO REFORM AND CIVILIZE SOCIETY: and his acts were just such as the condition of the times required for the attainment of these two great purposes. The chief fault of those who have censured him has been, that they have judged his conduct, not by the circumstances of his own time and the jurisprudence which then obtained, but by the maxims and ideas of the present day,—than which nothing could be more unjust.

I. Our blessed Redeemer foretold[1] that scandals should come; and even under His own eyes, and in the college of apostles, though taught immediately by Himself, a most grievous scandal was given, by that traitorous disciple who sold his divine Master. It was not then to be expected, that the members of the church, even the ministers of her altars, should be all of them stainless. It was not promised that the gates of hell should not *rage* against the Church, but that they should not *prevail*.[2] The storm was to howl fiercely around the ship of the Church, while pursuing her voyage over the stormy ocean of life; but in the hour of her greatest peril, when every thing would threaten shipwreck, and the timid would exclaim: "Lord, save us, we perish,"—Jesus would arise from his apparent slumber, extend his hand over the boiling waves, command the winds and the sea, and suddenly there should come a great calm.[3]

This miracle has been renewed in all the great emergencies of the Church. "She may be attacked, she cannot be conquered." Persecution has tried her, and she came out fresher and better than ever. Heresy has assailed her on all sides, and yet she has gained the victory. At the period of which we are speaking, a flood of immorality broke in upon her, penetrating even within the sacred chancel of her sanctuary; and yet from this new and most terrible ordeal she was destined likewise to come out, unharmed and unsullied. Perhaps the preservation of the Church, under such circumstances, is a greater miracle of God's providence than any other recorded in her annals.

Gregory VII. was the chief instrument employed by God for the correction of the crying moral evils of his age. His vast mind immediately perceived the source from which this torrent of disorders flowed; and he directed all his gigantic efforts for nearly thirty-six years, towards drying it up. The Church had unworthy ministers, and she had to weep over many immoralities, even at the foot of her altars, precisely because she had been enslaved by the princes of the earth,—her canons contemned, her liberties crushed, and her very sanctuaries sacrilegiously invaded, by those who were clothed with the civil power.

The right of investiture, claimed chiefly by the emperors of Germany, was the principal cause of all these evils of the Church. The emperors, having richly endowed the bishoprics and abbeys, claimed the right of nominating the incumbent, and of investing the subject thus appointed with the *insignia* of his office. The new incumbent took an oath of fealty, which required, among other things, that he should join the standard of his sovereign with his armed retainers, whenever called on to do so. In the appointment to bishoprics, more regard was often had to birth and military talents, than to the virtues and learning required by the canons. What was still worse, these preferments were often purchased by money, and the most unworthy men were thus thrust into the holy places. Under the wicked and dissolute Henry IV., simony, and consequent immorality, became the order of the day in Germany and northern Italy, where his power in this matter was the more baneful, because it was less questioned. The Church was thus disgraced with wicked ministers, because the princes of the world *had thrust them on her.*

---

[1] Matt. xviii.

[2] Matt. xvi.

[3] Matt. viii, 25, 26.

The right of investiture was manifestly an usurpation of the German emperors and other princes,—at least in the sense in which it was understood and carried out by them. It was viewed not only by Gregory, but by many other holy men of the time,—such as St. Anselm of Luca,[1] and St. Peter Damian,[2]—as the chief cause of all the evils which they so much deplored. It was in direct opposition to the enactments of the ancient canons regarding the election of bishops. These secured to the Church the right of choosing her own ministers, as well as perfect freedom in the exercise of that right. If the people often co-operated in the election of bishops, during the first centuries, it was more as witnesses of the good qualities of the candidate, than as electors; and perhaps one cause of the modification of discipline in this respect was the well grounded fear, that when the people would become more numerous, and perhaps less pious, popular clamor might impair the liberty of election.

Princes never had the right of nomination to bishoprics, without the consent and concurrence of the Church. The thirtieth canon of those called the Apostolic,—believed by the learned to exhibit pretty accurately the discipline of the three first centuries of the Church,—pronounces sentence of deposition against bishops who receive their sees from princes. The fourth canon of the great council of Nice, held in 325, regulates the manner of appointing bishops by the prelates of the province, or by at least three of them; without even alluding to any right of the people or of princes in the matter.[3] The twenty-second canon of the eighth general council, held at Constantinople in 870, goes still farther, and pronounces an anathema against any lay prince, who would interfere in the "election or promotion of any patriarch, metropolitan, or bishop, so as to prevent its canonical freedom."[4] Many other authorities could be produced, to prove that the claim set up by the princes of the eleventh century, not only had no sanction from the Church, but was in the very face of all its rights and laws. By being liberal to the Church, temporal princes acquired no right to enslave it, and to introduce into its bosom the feudal, on the ruins of the canon law.

Yet this was precisely what was attempted to be done; and for resisting this usurpation and contending strongly until death for the liberty of the Church, Gregory has sustained so much obloquy! Could he have done otherwise, without betraying his duty, and, to use his own strong language, "by satisfying the caprices of princes, being hurled with them into the abyss?"[1] So far was this pretended right of investiture carried, that the German emperors even asserted it in regard to the Roman Pontiff himself, thereby seeking to crush the liberty of the Church in its head,—in the only one able effectually to resist the ever encroaching usurpation.

---

[1] Sermon. ii.

[2] Ep. ii, et passim.

[3] Labbei. Concil. tom ii, p. 30.

[4] Id. Tom. viii. p. 1141.

The emperors had more than once attempted to elect and depose Popes at will; but they had always met with powerful resistance from the Church, and never succeeded in causing more than temporary confusion. Sometimes called to the eternal city, as its natural guardians, to quell popular insurrection, or to assert the liberty of the Church, they often went beyond the mere office of protection, and sought to rule in spiritual, as well as in temporal matters. In one of his journeys to Rome (after the middle of the tenth century,) Otho the Great, emperor of Germany, with the aid of the antipope—styled Leo VIII., whom he had himself set up,—had a decree or canon passed, by which the emperor's right to interpose in the election of the Pope was recognized; and though the provisions of this law were annulled by Henry II., in the beginning of the following century, they were renewed by Conrad II., and they subsequently became the cause of incalculable evils to the Church. In consequence of this innovation on ancient law, there were three claimants to the papal chair at one time; and Henry III., the father of Henry IV., paid a visit to Rome, and succeeded in suppressing the schism, without, however, giving up the pretended privilege from which this and other evils had sprung.

It required a man of the iron nerve of Gregory VII. to wrest from the hands of the German emperors, what they would not have willingly resigned! And how wisely and how effectually he did it, M. Voigt fully informs us, and we shall have occasion to show more at length hereafter. Those writers who would fain persuade their readers that the controversy about investitures was one of mere form, show only their profound ignorance of history. It was a vital question,—one of liberty or slavery for the Church.

So long as kings and princes exercised this pretended right, can we wonder at the dreadful evils which St. Peter Damian so pathetically laments? Can we be astonished, that this good man should weep, like another Jeremiah, over the calamities of God's people, and the desecration of his holy places; or that, reposing near the sanctuary which he so much loved, he should shed tears over its desolation and abandonment, while the courts of princes were thronged with a worldly minded clergy?[2] Can we wonder, that when he had exhausted all the resources of prose, he resorted to poetry, and wept in plaintive numbers over the evils of his day? And that finally, disgusted with a world which he did not love, and which he despaired to be able to reform, he fled to solitude, and devoted himself entirely to prayer?

---

[1] Ep. i, 11.

[2] Ep. i, 15.

M. Voigt ascribes Damian's retirement to a feeling of envy at Hildebrand's superiority. But there is little foundation for this assertion. The expressions of Damian, in which he calls Hildebrand "his holy adversary,"[1] and "his hostile friend,"[2] and others of the same kind, only show some diversity of opinion and temperament between the two illustrious men; but they do not prove that there existed any jealousy. Hildebrand opposed his retiring, but Pope Alexander II. permitted it, on condition that Damian would come forth again, whenever the Church should need his services.

Hildebrand was cool and deliberate, Damian was ardent and enthusiastic; but they both labored together for the same glorious object, — the extirpation of simony and incontinence among the clergy, and the stricter observance of the ancient canons. And that they were always good friends, may be gathered from a letter written by Damian from solitude, in which, complaining that Hildebrand had not written to him oftener, he speaks of the manner in which he had ever co-operated with him: "in all his (Hildebrand's) struggles and victories, he (Damian) had thrown himself in, not as a mere fellow soldier or follower, but as a thunder-bolt," an expression which shows the impetuosity of his zeal.[3]

There is no doubt, that the language of St. Peter Damian should be received with some allowance; but yet it appears certain, that the evils deplored by him were both widely spread and inveterate. How deeply seated was the malady, may be gathered from the long and obstinate resistance of the clergy of Milan and Lombardy to the proposed reformation; from the repeated tumults in Milan consequent upon the zealous efforts made by the holy deacon Arialdo, and by the pious chevaliers Landulph and Herlembaud, to enforce the canons of the Church; from the tragical death of Arialdo, so graphically related by M. Voigt;[4] from the outrages which, in 1074, disgraced the synod of Erfurt, over which Sigefrid, archbishop of Mayence presided, as legate of the Pope, and where he so strenuously sought to extirpate abuses; from the elections of the two antipopes, Cadolous and Guibert, and the awful troubles brought upon Rome and the Church by their wicked ambition: in a word, from the whole life of Greg[illegible] VII., which was one continued struggle against vice and immorality seated in high places. All these scandals and troubles were the work of a faction, it is true, but of a strong and powerful faction, aided and urged on by some of the greatest princes of Europe, among whom Henry IV. of Germany, and Philip I. of France were the most conspicuous.

Such was the sad state of things in the Church, when Hildebrand was unanimously elected Pope by the clergy and people of Rome, in 1073. He was the very man who was best calculated to meet the emergency. He brought to the pontifical chair an experience of twenty-four years, during which he had been actively employed in various important affairs by previous Pontiffs. From the pontificate of the holy Pope Leo IX. (A. D.

---

[1] "Sanctus satanas meus."

[2] "Hostilis amicus meus"

[3] Ep. ii. 8. "Certaminibus et victoriis, ego me non commilitonem seu pedissequum, sed quasi fulmen injeci."

[4] Vol. i, p. 153.

1049), who had made him archdeacon of the Roman Church, to the day of his own election, he was the right arm of the Church's defense. So great was the confidence entertained in his judgment, that St. Peter Damian,[1] says, that he himself followed his opinions as he would the canons of the Church. It was he who had prompted Bruno, bishop of Toul, nominated Pope by Henry IV., to take off the *insignia* of the papacy at the monastery of Cluny, to walk as a pilgrim to Rome, and not to accept of the tiara, until he should be canonically elected by the clergy and people of that city. This was his first step towards the emancipation of the Church. He it was who advised, and perhaps even penned the famous canon[2] of the Roman council, held under Nicholas II., in 1059, which fixed the mode of electing the sovereign Pontiff by the cardinals, with the consent of the people, and made the approval by the emperor a mere personal privilege to belong to those emperors ONLY, to whom it would be specially granted by the Pope.[3]

Having brought to the pontificate so much wisdom, learned from experience, he employed it all in the government of the Church. He undertook nothing rashly. He was as cool and deliberate in taking his measures, as he was firm and persevering in carrying them out. All his efforts for the extinction of simony and incontinence among the clergy, and every stage of his struggle with Henry IV., of Germany, evidence his coolness and wisdom. He was consistent throughout. Every thing tended to the carrying out of his great plan, — to secure the freedom of the Church, and then to enforce its ancient canons. He steadily pursued this darling object for nearly thirty-six years. He was too clearly convinced of the soundness of his principles, and of the justice of his cause, ever to waver or falter in his course for one moment.

Yet he was not excessively stern, as many are inclined to believe. He had a tender and susceptible heart, sometimes filled "with an immensity of joy,"[4] and anon, "straitened with the most cruel grief."[5] His conduct towards Henry IV., when the latter humbly sued for reconciliation with the Church at the ca[illegible] of Canossa, is not an exception to his general character in this respect. He indeed treated Henry with some rigor, because he had too much reason to doubt the sincerity of the young king's repentance, and the event furnished too sad a proof of his forecast. Yet it must be borne in mind, that, though Henry immediately after broke all his solemn oaths, Gregory abstained for more than three years from renewing the excommunication, though repeatedly urged to do so. And when he did renew it, it was with the greatest reluctance.

He was severe towards the obstinate, but at the first sign of repentance, his heart melted with sympathy. His kind treatment of Berengarius, who recanted his errors in the synod of Rome in 1079, is a well known evidence of this. He even offered to pardon the wicked antipope Guibert of Ravenna, in case he would repent;[1] and he repeatedly proffered to receive Henry himself again into the Church, even after all his enormities, if he would but repent and repair the enormous scandals he had given.[2] He himself informs us, that he was accused of too much leniency,[3] and Cardinal Hugh de Die, his legate in France, complained of the facility with which he absolved those ecclesiastics who had been excommunicated in French councils.[4]

---

[1] Ep. ii, 8.

[2] Labb. Tom. ix, p. 1108.

[3] It is one evidence of the great genius and wisdom of Gregory VII. that the requirements of this canon are followed, with but few modifications, to this day, in the election of the Pope.

[4] Gaudii repleti immensitate, Ep. i, 40.

[5] Circumvallat me dolor immanis, Epp. ii, 49.

His activity was prodigious. By means of his legates he was every where actively engaged, by means of councils both provincial and national, in reforming abuses, and restoring ecclesiastical discipline. His vast mind grasped the whole world, and yet entered every where into the most minute details! He has left nine books of letters written to every class of persons, from the prince on his throne, to the monk in his cell. His penetrating eye reached even Africa, where the few Christians who were then left, were trampled under foot by the Moors.[5] He was very solicitous about the reunion of the Greek with the Latin Church. He was the first to conceive the project of a crusade, one great object of which was to aid the struggling Christians of the east, and to heal the Greek schism.

This conception alone would show the vastness of his mind. He made two efforts to arouse Europe to a sense of its importance; — but Europe was not yet prepared to throw herself on Asia. Hungary, Bohemia, Russia, Denmark, and Spain were all sharers in his pastoral solicitude. He seemed to attend to each thing, as though he had nothing else to do; and even when beset by the greatest difficulties, he relaxed in nothing his ceaseless labors for the general good of the Church. He celebrated in Rome no less than eight councils, all of which were very numerously attended.

His letters exhibit perhaps the best portrait of his mind and heart. His style is similar to that of St. Gregory the Great, whom he greatly admired. Those who accuse him of worldly ambition have either not read, or have not understood his correspondence. It all breathes far higher motives, and a spirit not of this world. M. Voigt has exhibited a condensed analysis of his principles and maxims as extracted from his letters; which analysis evinces great industry, and a thorough acquaintance with the subject.[6]

But the quality which most distinguished Gregory was his moral courage. No dangers appalled him; no obstacles or difficulties deterred him from doing what was right. His soul grew with the events which it had to encounter. "The most fearful outbreaks of regal or popular displeasure could not move his fixed purpose. He had planted himself on eternal truth, and the wind and the rain might beat upon, but they could never stir him." Who will not admire the calm composure which he manifested, when he was seized on Christmas-night, at the very altar, by an armed band of assassins led on by Cencius; when he was cruelly beaten,— his hair plucked out, his pontifical robes torn off, and himself dragged off a prisoner to their leader's castle? Who will not admire the forbearance which requited this outrage, with so effectual an interposition, as screened its chief perpetrator from the effects of popular indignation? Who will not be struck by the noble courage manifested by him, in the last council he held in Rome, in 1083, when, beset on all sides with difficulties innumerable,— with Henry's victorious troops threatening Rome,— he arose in the council, and, with the face "more of an angel than of a man,"[1] spoke with an eloquence so stirring, as to move all who were present even unto tears! This noble courage was his great ruling feeling, strong even in death; and the memorable words, which were the last he uttered before he expired, an exile at Salerno,[2]—"I have loved justice, and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile,"—contribute much to give us an insight into his character.

---

[1] Ep. v, 13.

[2] Cardinal Arago gives us Gregory's reply to the Romans, when pressed by Henry's besieging army. they besought the Pontiff to absolve him. Gregory offered to do it, but only on the condition abov named. Voigt, vol. ii, p. 416.

[3] Ep. i, 77.

[4] Voigt, vol. ii, p. 293.

[5] Ep. i, 22, 23. See Voigt, vol. i, p. 35.

[6] North American Review, for July, 1845.

II. Such were the qualities of Gregory; such the difficulties he had to contend with in fulfilling the duties growing out of his spiritual relations to the church. He had to encounter obstacles yet more fearful, in his temporal relations to civil society. He could not expect to carry out his favorite plan of reformation, without being thwarted at every step by the princes of the earth. Besides the pernicious influence of their example, their claims in regard to investiture were, as we have seen, openly at war with the liberties, and subversive of the dearest interests of the Church. Gregory saw fully the difficulty of his position. He perceived the storm which was gathering, and he was prepared to endure its most merciless peltings. He quailed not, either in the anticipation, or when the fearful reality more than justified his worst forebodings.[3]

The charges brought against him by his enemies are many, but they may be reduced to two principal heads.

1. He is accused of ambition, in seeking to make the kings of Hungary, Dalmatia, Sardinia, Spain, and England take the oath of fealty to the holy see: and he is charged with aiming at universal dominion in civil as well as in ecclesiastical matters. 2. He is greatly blamed for having attempted to depose Henry IV., emperor of Germany.

We will endeavor briefly to meet both these accusations; and also to prove that, in his relations to princes, his powerful influence was highly beneficial to civil society.

1. All the writers of the eleventh century paint Europe as being in a most distracted condition. England was passing through a revolution

---

[1] See Labb. Concil tom. x, p. 402 "Ore magis angelico quam humano."

[2] Dilexi justitiam, odi iniquitatem; ideo morior in exilio.— Paul Bernried c. 110.

[3] Speaking of Henry (Ep. 1, 11), he uses this remarkable language: Et certe tutius est defendendo veritatem pro sui ipsius salute adusque sanguinem nostrum sibi resistere, quam ad explendam ejus voluntatem iniquitati consentiendo secum, quod absit ad interitum ruere.

under William the Conqueror, and the south of Italy was also being revolutionized by Robert Guiscard; while Spain was struggling with the Moors, and Germany was torn by the most fierce civil wars between Henry IV., and the princes of the empire. France was not free from internal troubles, while its southern frontier was threatened by the Saracens; and in the east, Constantinople was tottering to its fall, and the rising dynasty of the Turks menaced with extermination the Christian name, in places where it had been once so illustrious. In civil society every thing was in a state of disorder; the laws were trampled under foot with impunity; and *might* and *right* were viewed as almost synonymous terms. The weak were oppressed by the strong; and the feudal system, which had just obtained a firm foothold in Europe, was bringing forth its bitter first fruits — of anarchy, petty civil wars, and bloodshed. St. Peter Damian[1] draws a graphic picture of the manner in which the feudal chieftains robbed one another, and then recklessly "set fire to the cottage of the poor laborer." And Gregory VII., in many of his epistles, weeps over the murders and confusion of his time, calling it appropriately "THE AGE OF IRON."

In this distracted condition of things, only one power was universally acknowledged and respected — that of the Church, and of its visible head, the Sovereign Pontiff. And we are not to be surprised at seeing princes often invoking this power whenever they got into difficulties with their subjects, or with one another. Nor was this always a mere mark of respect to the holy see — it was oftener a prudential measure for their own security. When, by taking the oath of fealty to the Pope, they became the feudal subjects of the holy see, they had a right to expect from it protection against foreign invasion of their kingdom or domestic usurpation of their throne. Thus, in return for a fealty, which included chiefly spiritual obedience to the Pope, with a very small annual offering to the papal treasury, they often received from the holy see the most substantial favors. Any one who recklessly invaded a state thus placed under the "protection of St. Peter," after having been admonished to desist, incurred, if he persisted, the sentence of excommunication.

Such being the case, we are not astonished that kings and princes in those troubled times often placed their crowns at the Pontiff's feet. Thus Demetrius, king of Russia, sent his son all the way to Rome to implore[2] Pope Gregory VII., to receive his kingdom as a fief of the holy see; and Gregory in his answer,[3] seems to grant his request with some reluctance, and requires of him what was usually required in such cases, that he should promise to assist his liege sovereign, (the holy see) "*in all things just.*" Many kings in dying left their kingdoms under the protection of the Pope; and whenever a powerful baron or neighboring prince sought to violate this testamentary disposition, to the prejudice of the infant heir, the Pope interposed, as in the case of Vezelin,[4] who attempted to usurp the throne of Dalmatia. Thus also Henry III., left his infant son Henry IV., under the guardianship of his widow, the empress Agnes, and of Pope Victor II.

---

[1] Ep. i, 15, supra cit.

[2] "Devotis precibus." (Ep. ii, 74.)

[3] Ibid.

[4] See St. Gregory, VII. Ep. vii, 4.

It is not necessary to multiply facts to prove that one great feature of medieval jurisprudence was the express or tacit acknowledgment of a kind of universal protectorate in the Roman Pontiff. We find even the fierce Robert Guiscard bowing down and taking the oath of fealty to the holy see. It is proper however to observe here, once for all, that the oath of feudal vassalage did not imply unlimited obedience — much less did it enforce a slavish submission in all things to the will of the liege lord. Feudal allegiance was very different from that of modern times. The former was peculiar to the middle ages, and its duties were few and clearly marked, requiring at the same time as a condition *sine qua non*, the compliance with certain correlative duties on the part of him to whom the oath was taken.

Gregory could not hope to carry out his plan for reforming the Church, without the co-operation of temporal princes. From many of them he had reason to expect the most determined opposition. Hence, it is not at all surprising, that, intent upon *one great idea*, he sought, from the very commencement of his pontificate, to rally around him the princes of the earth. This will explain to us his course of conduct in regard to Dalmatia, Hungary, Sardinia, and part of Spain, which, in various letters, he sought to prove, to have been in former times feudal dependencies of the holy see. We read of no resistance to his claims in any of these countries, which proves that they were well founded, and that the documents he alleged where genuine. This should put to shame those maligners of the sainted Pontiff, who would fain persuade us, that he forged documents to suit his own purposes!! To prove, that the princes and people of the middle ages were not advocates of passive obedience, even to the Pope, particularly where temporal matters were concerned, we may adduce the refusal by William the Conqueror, to take the oath of fealty to Gregory. His answer to the Pontiff is brief, blunt, and characteristic of the Norman: yet even *he*, while positively refusing to take the oath, says nothing in his answer to impugn the motives of Gregory.[1] He had been the early favorite of Gregory, who had extolled him as a model of princes;[2] and on his refusal to take the oath, the Pontiff in his letter to his English legate Humbert, only complains of the bluntness of the English monarch, and of his refusal to suffer the English bishops to visit Rome. This last fact will perhaps explain to us his motive for endeavoring to induce William to take the oath.

Those who would charge Gregory with motives of mere worldly ambition, have not learned the first elements of his character. Had worldly grandeur been his object, why did he not obtain it, as he certainly could have done? Why did he not doff his humble and coarse apparel, and clothe himself in the "soft garments of kings?" Why did he not keep up a splendid court, and live luxuriously in the midst of earthly pomp and display? Why did he not die a great temporal prince, instead of a poor exile at Salerno? Ambition, forsooth! Nothing was more foreign from his mind and heart than ambition. All his letters breathe a higher spirit; all his acts imply much higher motives. He was not a man to swerve one iota from the plain path of duty, for all the kingdoms of the world! "I would rather," says he, "undergo death for your salvation, than obtain the whole world, to your spiritual ruin. For I fear God, and therefore value but little the pride and pleasures of the world.[1]

---

[1] See his answer to the Pontiff in Voigt, vol ii, p. 330, note.

[2] See Voigt, vol. i, p. 425.

2. Much has been written of the Pontiff's long and painful struggle with Henry IV. of Germany; but those who have taken occasion from it to cast all the blame on Gregory, betray great ignorance of the history of that remarkable contest. In the first place, who was Henry, and what was his character? He was the most powerful sovereign of his day, and his vast empire extended over more than half of Europe. His influence was immense for good or for evil. He was in his twenty-third year, when Gregory was raised to the pontificate. His many natural good qualities had been almost destroyed by a vicious education from his earliest youth—the stream of his existence had been tainted in its very course. He had given into the most criminal excesses from the time he had first mounted the throne, and from a confirmed *debauchee*, had become the most heartless and cruel of men. For his criminal excesses, and his shameful sale of bishoprics and abbeys, he had been already summoned to appear before the holy see, in the last year of Pope Alexander II.[2] This summons had no other effect upon the dissolute young king, than to cause him to enter momentarily into himself: but on the death of Alexander, his excesses became more enormous and insufferable than ever. He no longer observed any bounds. His court resembled more the seraglio of a Turkish sultan, than the residence of a Christian prince.

Perhaps a greater monster never disgraced a throne. To obtain the objects of his criminal passions, he stopped at nothing—husbands, fathers, or lovers were removed by assassination! He knew how to refine on cruelty: he could smile on you one day, and have a dagger sent to your heart the next! In adversity, he was the meanest of sycophants, and the most crouching of slaves: look at him at the diet of Tribur,[3] when the Saxons were victorious, and the princes of the empire had abandoned him; look at him also at the castle of Canossa, when suing for reconciliation with the Church. When flushed with victory, he was the most ferocious of tyrants—crushing and trampling in the dust those who had already submitted: witness the horrible manner in which he overran Saxony, Thuringia, and Suabia, as most graphically painted by Voigt. He was as perfidious, as he was cruel. He could be bound neither by treaties the most solemn, nor by oaths the most sacred. In one word, he was the Nero of the middle ages, and his cotemporaries gave him this title. All these charges could be substantiated by facts almost innumerable from M. Voigt, were it deemed necessary.

---

[1] Ep. vi, 1.

[2] See Voigt, vol. i. p. 22.

[3] Ibid, vol. ii, 168-9.

Such was the monster with whom Gregory had to deal. He could not escape a contest with such a man, without sacrificing his most sacred duty. For, in addition to Henry's private and political crimes, he made a regular traffic of the bishoprics and abbeys, intruding into them the most unworthy subjects; thus deluging the church with a flood of scandals. He would sell a bishopric to one, and if another subsequently offered more, he would have the former deposed as simoniacal, and bestow the investiture upon the latter! By this abuse, some of the principal churches had two, and that of Milan, had three bishops at one time! Thus schisms were added to the other evils of the Church.

How did Gregory deport himself in his controversy with Henry? The limits of this article will not allow more than a very brief *exposé* of the various stages of that contest; and those who may wish a fuller account of it, are referred to the luminous work of M. Voigt. We will endeavor to present in order the various facts of the case, scattered through the two volumes of our author; and we think it will be seen, that a simple unadorned statement of facts is the best possible vindication of Gregory's course.

1. From the very commencement of his pontificate, he employed every means in his power to win the heart of Henry. He wrote to him two letters[1] full of sweetness, unction, and a divine eloquence, in which he appealed to him by every consideration that was calculated to touch his heart, and arouse him to a proper sense of his duty: in both of them he however hinted to him, that, in conformity with the jurisprudence of the age, the right to the crown could be secured to him, *only* on condition "of his governing according to the law of God, and protecting the liberty of his holy Church." To his own efforts, his influence added those of Henry's mother, the pious Empress Agnes, and of the Countesses Beatrix and Matilda, his (Henry's) relatives; not to mention those of the great and good Anno, archbishop of Cologne.

2. When Henry, notwithstanding the hopes with which his answer had at first inspired Gregory, still continued in his evil courses, the latter did not immediately excommunicate him. He proceeded slowly and cautiously. His object throughout seems to have been to correct, not to crush Henry. He first excommunicated the unworthy bishops who had purchased their sees from him; then five of his evil counsellors: hoping that he would profit by these unequivocal demonstrations. And whenever Henry made the least show of repentance, with what paternal tenderness did not the Pontiff felicitate him![2] About this time, (A. D. 1073), Henry wrote him a most submissive and hypocritical letter;[3] and though Gregory saw through the deceit, and knew well that Henry's difficult political

[1] See them in Voigt, vol. i, 407-8. Mr. Voigt thinks that these letters are master pieces of prudence and eloquence. In general, all the epistles of Gregory breathe sentiments fresh from a heart warmed by divine charity.

[2] See his Ep. iii, 3.

[3] Voigt, vol., i p. 281.

position alone had prompted the letter, yet with what sweetness did he not answer this letter!

3. Nearly two years later, in 1075, occurred the infamous plot of Cencius, and the outrage upon Gregory's person, alluded to above. The Pontiff had every reason to believe, that Henry and Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, were at the head of this plot; and yet he forbore. He does not even allude to it in any of his controversies with Henry!

4. In the same year, 1075, the brave Saxons, after a noble struggle against tyranny, submitted to Henry, on the faith of a solemn treaty at Gerstungen, in which he promised to protect their property, and the liberty and rights of their princes.[1] Henry violated his solemn oaths, and trampled the brave Saxons in the dust. Crushed and bleeding, they appealed to the Pope for protection. The "holy see," says Mr. Voigt,[2] "*was the only tribunal, which could set any limits to imperial despotism, as a second defender of humanity.*" He might have said, that it was the *first*, and, in many cases, the *only* defender of *humanity*, of human liberty and rights. In those times of anarchy and confusion, to whom could the oppressed cry, but to the common father of Christians? Could Gregory be indifferent to their cry for relief? Could he do otherwise than hear their appeal, listen to their complaints, and endeavor to redress their wrongs? Henry himself had also appealed to the holy see against the Saxons;[3] so that Gregory saw both parties appealing to him to settle their quarrel. By the fact, he was virtually chosen *arbitrator*. Who can then blame him for taking cognizance of the cause, and for deciding in it according to justice? Would not posterity have censured him, had he neglected the appeal, thus solemnly interposed? At the instance of Rodolph, duke of Suabia, and of other German princes, Gregory had been induced[4] nearly two years previously, in 1073–4, to act as *mediator* between Henry and the rebellious Saxons. He had accepted the office, and had written a most eloquent letter[5] to many bishops and princes of Germany, imploring them to use their influence to stop the effusion of blood, until the difficulties could be amicably adjusted. But amidst the din of arms, this voice had not been heard. About the same time, Henry had sent ambassadors to Rome to complain of the Saxons:[6] so that he may be said to have appealed twice to the holy see. Gregory therefore had a right to interfere in the political affairs of Germany, under each of two characters—that of *mediator*, and that of *arbitrator*. Why have his enemies concealed these facts?

5. And who were the Saxons, whose cause Gregory espoused? They were the oppressed: they were the advocates of *liberty!* The decision of Gregory against Henry was a blow aimed at tyranny, and struck for the rights of the people. If ever a people deserved liberty, the Saxons merited that boon. Instead of being the fierce savages that some

---

[1] Voigt, vol. ii, p. 78.
[2] Vol. ii, p. 98.
[3] Ibid. ii, p. 97.
[4] Ibid, vol. i, p. 360.
[5] Ep. i, 39.
[6] Ibid, vol. i, p. 381. Where he cites for his authority, his favorite historian Lambert.

historians would fain represent them, they were remarkable for their accurate perception of right and justice, and for their firm, yet moderate advocacy of their liberties. At the famous convention of the Saxon people at Nockmeslove, in 1073, Otto of Nordheim made a speech, which for solid reasoning, and moving eloquence, perhaps equals any effort of our own Patrick Henry.[1] Its stirring accents rang throughout all Saxony, and its effect was not only to thrill every bosom, but to cause the war cry "*To arms! to arms!*" to be heard from every valley and hill-top! To show in what light the oath of fealty to the king was viewed in those days, we will present the following extract from Otto's speech: —

> "Perhaps you hesitate to break the oath you have taken to the king, because you are Christians! What! To the king! So long as he was king for me — so long as he showed himself such, I have scrupulously observed the oath I had taken: since he has ceased to act like a king, and to discharge the duties of a king, I owe him fealty no longer. Courage then! We do not march against the king. No — but against the enemy of our liberty; against the enemy of our country, &c."

This reasoning only alleges a principle generally received in the middle ages: that *obedience* and *protection* are correlative terms, and that the former ceases to be obligatory, where the latter is wanting.[2] According to this principle, Henry could have been deposed without the sanction of the Pope: and in fact the princes of the empire seriously thought of doing so before Gregory had spoken. The Saxons, in appealing to the Pope, had not only expressly recognized in him the power of deposing princes, but had said, that the German empire was a fief of the holy see.[3] In fine, Gregory, while declaring *under all the circumstances*, that the Saxons were absolved from their oath of allegiance to Henry, did precisely what every American and every lover of liberty would have done.

6. In answer to the appeal of the Saxons, Gregory wrote a letter to Henry, in which, after having employed all his eloquence to reclaim him, he threatened him with excommunication, unless he repented and reformed.[4] Flushed with his recent victory over the Saxons, Henry despised the admonitions of the Pontiff. He assembled a conventicle at Worms, in 1075, which attempted to depose Gregory, and to set up Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, in his stead.[5] He directed two insolent letters to the Roman people and to the Pope, to announce to them the decision of the mock council: and he sent Rolando, a secret emissary, to insult the Pontiff to his face in the council which he was to open in Rome.

---

[1] Whoever will read the portion of this famous speech, given us by Mr. Voigt, (vol. i, p. 288-9, &c.) will scarcely think this an exaggeration. If some one would take the trouble to collect together the various famous speeches of the middle ages, and present them in a good English dress, he would add to the stock of medieval literature. This speech, two or three of Gregory before Roman councils, and one of Urban II. at the council of Cleremont in 1096, might belong to the collection.

[2] See decision of a council of Toledo referred to by Guizot — Lectures, &c., where this principle is connected with the etymology of the word *rex, recte*.

[3] See Voigt, vol. ii, p. 98. [4] Ibid, p. 103. [5] Ibid, p. 107.

Gregory screened the envoy from the punishment which his insolence provoked: he read the insulting documents himself to the council, with the utmost *sang froid*; and, in order to let the excitement subside, he adjourned the session until the next day. He then calmly explained, to the one hundred and ten assembled bishops, the whole of his past relations with Henry, and his wish to secure the freedom and peace of the Church. It was only at the most urgent request of the council, that he consented to excommunicate Henry.[1]

7. It is manifest, that, in the whole proceeding, Gregory wished to correct, and not to degrade Henry: hence, in a letter to the princes and bishops of Germany, he promised to readmit him on repentance.[2]

8. It was a law of the German empire, that if a prince remained under excommunication for one year, he forfeited his crown.[3] Hence it was, that Henry was in so much haste to be absolved by Gregory at Canossa.

9. If Gregory deposed Henry, the consent of princes and people at that time secured to him the right to do so. This is so certain, that it is not deemed necessary to adduce facts to prove it. Voigt admits it;[4] and his translator proves it by incontestable cotemporary documents.[5] Gregory then usurped nothing; — he is fully borne out by the spirit and the jurisprudence of his age.[6]

10. Finally, though Henry was not sincere in obtaining absolution from the excommunication at Canossa; though in less than fifteen days thereafter he broke all his solemn oaths; yet Gregory abstained for nearly four years from renewing the excommunication. His legates in Germany went beyond their instructions, when, at the diet of Forcheim in 1077, they approved of the election of Rodolph. He often lamented this imprudent step.[7] He viewed it as premature, and calculated to foment, rather than to remedy the troubles of Germany and of the Church; and he declares, that "he would rather suffer death, if necessary, than be the cause of the troubles of the Church."[8] He labored incessantly to heal the divisions of Germany, and to stop the effusion of blood; council after council he assembled in Rome; diet after diet he appointed to be held in Germany, for the final settlement of the matter. But Henry thwarted all his measures: so far from seeking, he was afraid of that justice which Gregory wished to have meted out to him. *He*, then—and not Gregory—was responsible for the protracted civil war in Germany.

Such was Gregory VII., as shown by his acts. Henry triumphed over him for a time; and he died an exile; but he died as he had lived—virtuous, calm, unshaken, and happy. Henry died, reduced to the lowest degradation, abandoned by all and despised by all, even by his own sons, who had successfully carried on a civil war against him. Gregory was "the Hercules of the middle ages: he enchained monsters, crushed the hydra of feudalism, saved Europe from barbarism, and what is more beautiful still, he illustrated Christian society by his virtues."[1]

---

[1] See Voigt, vol. ii, p. 115, et seq. [2] Ibid, p. 129. [3] Ibid, p. 137.

[4] Ibid, p. 214. [5] See his introduction, p. lix. et seq.

[6] See a work by Gosselin, published in Paris, 1829, entitled, "Pouvoir des Papes, sur les souverains, au Moyen Age." See also the admirable work of Count de Maistre, "Du Pape." Voltaire also admits this.

[7] This fact does not appear to be generally known. Even Feller (Dict. Hist. Art. Greg. VII.) ascribes the election of Rodolph to Gregory: and this too, in the face of many of the Pontiff's letters, and of his solemn declaration to the contrary at the Roman council held in 1080! He also asserts, that Gregory excommunicated Henry again, immediately after their reconciliation at Canossa in 1076: whereas, though his legates in Germany renewed the excommunication in 1077, yet the Pontiff himself abstained from doing so until 1080.

[8] Ep. iv, 24.

An able Protestant writer appreciates his noble courage, as well as the lofty motives which animated it, in the following eloquent language:

> "Had Hildebrand's sick heart failed him then, it would not have been strange; but he looked at his crucifix, at the image of his forsaken, dying, and yet victorious Master, and grew strong; for that told him how little the final triumph of a moral truth can be judged of from immediate success or failure. 'And I, too,' he murmured to himself, in words which, a few weeks later, were the last upon his lips, 'And I, too, have loved justice and hated iniquity, and I die an exile.' The future was hidden to him; but he knew that God ruled, that the great thoughts, which by his struggles he had made familiar to man, rested not on his strength, but on an eternal basis; and that, though he was passing away, the Omnipotent remained as the world's ruler;—he knew that he had sown the seed, and that God would give the harvest."[2]

We conclude with the last words of M. Voigt's history:

> "It is difficult to bestow on him exaggerated eulogy: for he has laid everywhere the foundation of a solid glory. But every one should wish to render justice to whom justice is due; let no one cast a stone at one who is innocent: let every one respect and honor a man who has labored for his age, with views so grand and so generous. Let him who is conscious of having calumniated him, re-enter into his own conscience."

---

[1] Abbe Jager, Introd. p. xcix.

[2] North American Review, 1845.

IX. THE GREAT SCHISM OF THE WEST.

ROME AND AVIGNON.*

The Reformers before the Reformation — Bonnechose and D'Aubignè compared — The former as an historian — Is he ingenuous or fair? — Inaccuracies — Scope of his work — The Schism a fiery ordeal for the Church — From which she came forth unscathed — Scandals to be expected — Morality of the Popes — Origin of the Schism — The papacy "stooping to conquer" — Contest between Boniface VIII., and Philip the Fair — The death of Boniface, and election of his successor — Intrigues of Philip — The Popes reside at Avignon — Their policy — Return to Rome — Election of Urban VI. — Defection of Cardinals — They set up Clement VII. — Who moves to Avignon — Political ambition of princes — The evil and the remedy come from France — University of Paris — Council of Pisa — And of Constance — Election of Martin V. — End of the Schism — Remarks — Triumph of the Church — Relation of the Pope to a general council — Reforming the Church "in its head and members" — The succession not interrupted — Two objections answered — Church emerged from the Schism stronger than ever — And so did the papacy.

WE suppose it was the shrewd Irish translator, or the enterprising American publishers, who prefixed to the title-page of the work of M. Bonnechose the additional sentence, "An introduction to 'D'Aubignè's History of the Reformation.'" Whoever did it, it was a lucky idea, based on a proper appreciation of the qualities and relationship of the two publications. D'Aubignè and Bonnechose are evidently of a kindred spirit; they are a *par nobile fratrum.* Both are filled with a pious horror of Catholicity; both can find nothing good in the lives, character, or motives of Popes, cardinals, or bishops; both, we apprehend, are thoroughly imbued with the stern, unyielding, and gloomy spirit of Calvinism; and both have earnestly endeavored to infuse their own dark prejudices into the minds of others. Both write with great spirit and vigor; both have a sufficient smattering of learning to mislead the unlearned and unwary; both are violent and unscrupulous partisans. In fine, both are disingenuous, and both deal largely in sophistry and romance.

But we consider the "Introduction" a far more able, and, therefore, a far more dangerous production, than the work itself by the historian "of the great Reformation." D'Aubignè is a religious fanatic and an historical romancer; he wholly suppresses at least one half of the evidence properly belonging to his subject, and greatly perverts the other half. He labors to invest his heroes with the romantic interest which attaches to the personal history of the paladins of knight-errantry; he dragoons them into the ranks of saintship, whether they will or not;[1] he entirely conceals their many gross and glaring vices, and invents incidents and anecdotes to exhibit their superior righteousness!

---

*An Introduction to "D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation." The Reformers before the Reformation. The fifteenth century. John Huss and the Council of Constance. By Emile de Bonnechose, librarian of the king of France, author of "Histoire de France," "Histoire Sacrée," &c. Translated from the French by Campbell McKenzie, B. A., Trinity College, Dublin, Complete in one volume. 8vo., pp. 199. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1844.

This is so notoriously true, that an able Protestant writer in the Southern Quarterly Review freely admits "the utter futility of the 'History of the great Reformation,' as a text book, or an authority." He adds, with what we take for withering sarcasm, that "D'Aubignè may do for the Sunday school,"—where piety, based on a *holy* hatred of Rome, is more appreciated than truth,—"but for the student, the scholar, the theologer, the polemic, he is utterly useless—nay, he is worse than useless—he is positively pernicious."[2]

We think that the same verdict will be ultimately rendered by all intelligent men on the historical merits of M. Bonnechose, author of the book with the somewhat Hibernian title: "The Reformers before the Reformation." Yet this must be the work of time. M. Bonnechose is, as we have already intimated, a very different man from M. D'Aubignè. He at least has some pretensions to be an historian. He has evidently examined the original authorities; at least as many of them, as he deemed necessary to establish and illustrate his own favorite views of the subject which he undertook to handle. As a writer, he is grave, earnest, and often eloquent. His narrative is succinct and correct; and its interest is tolerably well sustained to the end. His statements and explanations of facts are ingenious and plausible; he is not, like D'Aubignè, glaringly inconsistent and absurd on almost every page. He even makes an occasional admission in favor of the Popes and of the Catholic Church, when the evidence is such that he cannot well help it: but even then he qualifies the admission; and you are almost tempted to believe that he makes it, as much with a view to appear impartial, and to lure on his readers to receive implicitly his other statements, as through a sincere love of truth.

In short, to refute him, a man must travel back to the record; he must minutely examine and thoroughly sift the original authorities; he must verify his references; must see whether he has given the true sense of the authors he quotes, whether he garbles passages, whether he omits portions of the testimony which would prove the contrary of what he asserts; in fine, he must see *what* authors he quotes, what is their weight and authority, what influences impelled them to write, and how far their testimony is to be relied on. Then another most important consideration must not be neglected: does the historian quote the cotemporary authors who wrote on *both* sides, or does he confine himself almost entirely to writers on *one* side? If the former, then may he claim the palm of impartiality, provided he quote honestly and fully; if the latter, he is a thorough partisan, who needs watching, and whose word you may rely on only so far as, by your own researches, you may ascertain it to be founded in truth.

Now, we don't profess to have gone through all the patient labor, and to have made all the researches just indicated. But we do claim to have done enough in the premises to satisfy our own minds, and to be able to convince impartial men, that M. Bonnechose is any thing but a safe or impartial historian. He quotes chiefly on one side only; and we distinctly charge him with garbling his own authors, in more instances than one. We have examined the originals, and we speak advisedly on the subject.

---

[1] Only think of the burly friar, Martin Luther,—the knight of the bottle, and the hero of the Black Eagle tavern of Wittemberg for fifteen years,—being a saint!

[2] Art. VII. of No. xiii. Oct. 1844.

We will, at present, indicate but two instances of this inexcusable disingenuousness. The first occurs on page 12, in the quotation from a work of Nicholas de Clemangis,[1] the secretary of Clement VII., the claimant of the papacy at Avignon; the other on page 50, in the translation of the well known safe conduct given by the emperor Sigismund to John Huss. In both cases, he gives the passages as continuous; and yet, what is your surprise at finding, on turning to the originals, that he has left out whole lines and phrases, materially affecting and even changing the sense! Can a man who does this be relied on as a safe guide?

But this is not all. Only think of a grave historian, in the nineteenth century, writing a book, too, which he wishes to be received as veracious history,—of a librarian of the French king, who ought surely to have known better,—seriously and solemnly quoting as authority Fox,[2] the notorious English martyrologist; the man who was convicted of having put down, in his canting book, the names of many martyred victims of papal cruelty, who, however, survived the publication of his work, and afterwards openly declared that they were not dead at all, but still living in spite of Fox's zeal against popery! Only think of his actually praising this same notorious Fox, and ranking him with the Bollandists![3]

But again. M. Bonnechose is often as inaccurate in his statement of important facts, as he is unsafe in his authorities, and loose in his manner of quoting them. We can, at present, stop to furnish but one instance of this: many others will come up in the sequel. He flippantly tells us that, "in three months after his (Urban VI.,) elevation to the popedom, the very persons that had chosen him protested against his election."[4]

Now, if this means, as the sequel would seem to imply, that, after *three* months, the cardinals proceeded to a new election, it is wholly unfounded in fact. Urban VI., was elected at Rome on the 8th day of April, 1378; and Clement VII. was chosen at Fondi on the 20th of September of the same year, making the interval between the two elections *five months* and

---

[1] He does not tell us even from what work of Clemangis or Clamengis he quotes. Nor does he furnish any marginal reference. The passage is found *entire* in Hardt—Council. Constant., C. 42, p. 46 of tom. i, part III, in a work *ascribed* to Clemangis, entitled, De corrupto Ecclesiæ Statu; and, at a later period, De Ruina Ecclesiæ. The work was, in all probability, not written by Clemangis at all, but about a century after his death, either by Bishop John de Chlem of Poland, or by another John de Chiemsée in Bavaria. The first edition of it appeared in Landshut in Bavaria, in 1524. This consideration upsets the whole authority of the book as a cotemporary history; and yet our author breathes not a syllable of all this. He could garble the book, but could not find space to tell his readers that its authenticity is, at best, very questionable.

[2] P. 198. Note. He depends on Fox for the articles of John Huss condemned in the council of Constance! Why not quote them at once from the acts of the council? Was Fox a cotemporary historian? On turning to the acts of the council, it will be perceived that Fox has cruelly misled him, both as to the order and the meaning of the propositions condemned.

[3] Preface, p. 1.

[4] Historical Introduction, p. 11.

twelve days. If the assertion about the *three* months mean only to mark the time of departure of the cardinals from Rome to Anagni, (not *Agnani,* as he writes it), it is still wrong. The proclamation of the cardinals assembled at Anagni, containing the protest alluded to, is dated August 9, 1378, *four* months and one day after the election of Urban VI. Nor let us be told that this is a very trifling fault, and that, in animadverting on it, we are hypercritical. The precise time intervening between the two elections is very important, in settling the relative claims to the papacy of the two aspirants ; and surely a grave historian, who pretends to write a veridical history, should have been more exact.

These are a few, out of the many reasons, which have led us to the conclusion that M. Bonnechose is not a safe historian, and that his assertions need some confirmation other than his own bare word. But the chief fault we have to find with him, is his glaring partiality, and his open hostility to the creed and persons of those who figure most conspicuously in his history. He evidently gloats over the evils and disorders attending the great papal Schism ; he has no sympathies to bestow upon a suffering and agonized Church, torn by schism within, and fiercely assailed by heresy from without : the sufferings of John Huss, of Jerome of Prague, and of the Hussites, seem to have engrossed all his sympathies, and to have exhausted his whole stock of humanity. In a word, he exhibits *all* the shades, with scarcely *any* of the lights of the picture. This is the greatest defect of the book.

We wish from our heart it had been otherwise. We are heartily tired of seeing history, which should be the noble and fearless witness of the truth, prostituted to the vile purposes of sectarian strife, and engaged in a grand conspiracy *against* the truth. We wish M. Bonnechose had approached his subject with a mind free from undue prejudice, and determined to ascertain and to publish *the truth* at all hazards. We wish he had been true, even to the purpose he conceived in undertaking his work, as he declares it in the preface :[1]

> "This work, in a historical point of view, is intended to make known and appreciated the great religious movement which took place a century before the reformation in Europe. It embraces a period of seventy years, which elapsed from the beginning of the GREAT SCHISM of the WEST in 1378, to the end of the war of the Hussites, towards the middle of the following century. The principal doctrines which divided Europe during that memorable period are exposed to view in it ; and the illustrious men who originated and defended them are carefully depicted."

The plan of the author thus embraced the history of the Great Schism, and of the rise and progress of the Hussites. It was perhaps the most disastrous period in Church History. Never, since the days of the apostles, had so many evils beset the Church at the same time, and threatened her very existence. More than once before, her peace had been disturbed by schism ; but there never had been a schism so appalling, of so long continuance, and so seemingly incurable, as that which rent her bosom during the last quarter of the fourteenth, and the first quarter of the fifteenth century. Never had she passed through an ordeal so fiery; never had her institutions had to abide so severe a test. To add to her embarrassment, a fierce and truculent heresy, threatening the very foundations of all society, both religious and political, then broke out, like a terrific storm, threatening to leave nothing but ruins in its course.

---

[1] Page 7.

As our author says, it was truly "a strange period and fruitful in storms,"[1] — "an unfortunate period when a spirit of boldness and violence agitated all classes of society, and produced in every direction sanguinary disorders."[2] We may almost apply to it, what Tacitus says of a certain disastrous era in Roman history, that it was a period "fertile in vicissitudes, atrocious in wars, discordant by seditions;" — and we add with him, in a qualified sense, "fierce even in peace."[3]

If ever the Church could be destroyed, this seemed the time clearly marked out for her destruction. If ever "the gates of hell could prevail over her," this seemed to be the period chosen for their triumph. If ever the solemn promises of Christ were to go unredeemed, and the Church, His spouse "without spot or wrinkle or blemish," "subject to Him in all things,"[4]—a spouse whom He had so long and so dearly loved, and for whom He had shed the last drop of His heart's purest blood, — was to be torn from His bosom, and to be rudely insulted, trodden under foot, and crushed by the nations, — now seemed to have arrived that time. But if Christ's love could not fail; if His purpose could not be baffled; if His promises could not be falsified; then might the bosom of this cherished spouse, no matter how dark the clouds which overhung her pathway, be still calm in the storm. Amidst all her sorrows, she might still hope, even against hope; and the result would prove,—and did prove,— that she hoped not in vain!

We care not, how many and how appalling were the disorders and dangers which then threatened the Church; we care not, how dark may be the shades of the picture which the *truth* of history may compel us to draw of the period in question: if the evils had been a hundred fold worse and more aggravated, the final and glorious triumph of the Church has *proved* that she is indestructible; — indestructible by moral disorders reigning in her midst, but never, for a moment, sanctioned by her authority,—indestructible by human passions,—indestructible by heresies,— indestructible by causes violently rending her very bosom, and which would certainly have inflicted death, had she been at all mortal.

We hope to show, as we progress, that we are not afraid of the truth, and of the *whole* truth. We are not surprised at scandals, because Christ foretold that they should come; and they are a necessary result of human depravity combined with free agency. The most ardent champion of the papacy never once dreamed, that the Roman Pontiff is either impeccable, or personally infallible in his private capacity. He is a man like others, knowing infirmity, beset with temptations, and exposed to commit sin. If Peter sinned, we need not be surprised that a few of his successors have followed his example. If one of the twelve, raised under the very eye of the blessed Jesus, and imbued from His lips with holy doctrine, became a traitor and an apostate, it is not at all surprising that a few Popes should likewise have fallen into vice. Every impartial man, no matter what his prejudices, will, however, admit that it is a fact, highly honorable to the venerable line of the Popes, that, out of more than two hundred and fifty of them, only five or six, at most, can be pointed out as immoral and wicked men.[1] And it is a proof of the true Catholic spirit, and of the noble freedom and candor which Catholicity inspires, that the vices of these men have been exposed and rebuked by Catholic writers more sternly, perhaps, than by even the bitterest enemies of the papacy.

---

[1] P. 117.

[2] P. 87.

[3] Opimum casibus, atrox prœliis, discors seditionibus, ipsa etiam pace sævum. Hist. l. i, c. 2.

[4] Ephesians ch. v.

As we cannot, within our narrow limits, undertake to examine the statements of M. Bonnechose in detail, we propose to do, what may perhaps be better, as well as more interesting and satisfactory to the general reader,—rapidly to go over the same ground which he has traversed; partly in his company, and partly in that of certain venerable old chroniclers whom he appears to have studiously avoided. And first, we will endeavor to furnish a condensed sketch of the causes, rise, progress, and termination of the Great Schism of the West: and then, in a separate paper, we will attempt to discuss the character of John Huss and his treatment by the council of Constance; and to unfold, in a summary manner, the history of the Hussites, both before and after the death of their founder.

As we proceed, we will endeavor to supply some of the manifold deficiencies, to correct the occasional blunders, and to expose the sophistry of our historian; so far at least as we shall be able to attain these objects, without turning too much from the path we have marked out. And we will advance nothing important, without a clear warrant from the original authorities themselves.[2]

Our author's theory on the origin of the Schism is obscure and vague enough.[3] If his words have any definite meaning,—and it would require one more sharp-sighted than ourselves to extract from them any clear signification,—they imply the opinion, that the Schism originated in the lofty ambition and exaggerated pretensions of the Popes. This is, to say the least, a very short-sighted and narrow view of the case. For more than seventy years before the Schism, there had been steadily at work a number of influences, partly internal and partly external to the papacy, which slowly but surely brought it about. The lawless ambition cherished by the different claimants of the popedom may have perpetuated the Schism, after it had already commenced; of itself it could scarcely have caused it, without the co-operation of other powerful influences.

---

[1] And even the vices imputed to some of these have been greatly exaggerated.

[2] The principal authorities on the Great Schism of the West are the following: the original documents contained in D'Achery—Spicilegium, t. i, p. 763, seqq.; in Martene and Durand—Thesaurus novus Anecd. tom. ii, p. 1073, seqq.; and in the Veterum Script. Amplissima Collectio by the same authors, tom. vii. p. 425, seqq. Also Theodoricus de Niem (writer to the Roman Popes from 1378 to 1410), libri iii, de Schismate, to which a fourth was afterwards added, with the title—Nemus Unionis—all published together, Basileae, 1566, fol. etc. This writer is bitter in his tone, barbarous in his Latin, and exaggerated in his statements. He is in consequence a special favorite of M. Bonnechose To these add the more recent writers: Louis Maimbourg (Catholic) Histoire du Grand Schisme d'Occident, a Paris, 1678, 4to.: Pierre du Puy (Catholic) Histoire du Schisme, Paris, 1700. 12mo: the Preface to the Ampliss. Collectio of Martene and Durand, *supra;* and the work of Jaq. L'Enfant (Calvinist) Hist. du Concile de Pise, l. i and ii—Amsterd. 1724. 4to Consult also *Labbaei* Concilia Pisanum et Constant. and De Hardt—Conc. Constant. tom. ii, p. 836, seq

[3] Introd. p. 10.

We are, however, free to admit, at the very outset, that the veneration universally paid to the Roman Pontiffs during the middle ages, and the temporal and political consequence with which a long train of events had invested the papal office, made the tiara a glittering prize for the ambitious aspirant. But that same deep and abiding reverence would not have brooked the ambition, which sought the dignity by undue means, or to the sacrifice of unity. It was the ambition of princes, much more than the ambition of Popes, which originated and perpetuated the Great Schism. Had the Church been left to herself, she would never have been rent by division.

In her humane efforts to subdue the ferocity, to correct the morals, and to humanize the manners of the European nations, during the earlier portion of the middle ages, the Church had been necessarily drawn into the vortex of European politics; and once drawn in, she was compelled to share in all its dangers, storms, and vicissitudes. The papacy had "stooped to conquer;" it had descended from its lofty position of mere spirituality into the arena of worldly affairs, in order to reclaim men from barbarism, and the result was, that to maintain itself in its new relations to society, it had to intermingle in scenes of worldly strife, and to surround itself with worldly consequence. The princes of Europe, who had freely acknowledged and encouraged this political power of the Popes, and who derived from it so many signal advantages, at length became weary of the restraints it imposed on them, and shook off the yoke: and the papacy was thus compelled to return to its original position. But, ere it did return, it bore on its body the marks of cruel wounds, received in the conflict with the princes of the world. The Great Schism of the west was a severe, but perhaps, a necessary lesson. It taught the papacy what it had to expect from that treacherous world which had crucified its Founder; it threw it back on its primitive resources; it taught it wherein lay its real strength, and the true secret of its vitality and indestructibility.

This general view of the subject sheds great light on the origin of the Schism. As we have already intimated, to explain the causes which led to it, we must go back for more than seventy years, to the period of the unfortunate controversy between Pope Boniface VIII.[1] and Philip the Fair, king of France. The circumstances of that unhappy difference are familiar to every reader of Church History; the results which grew out of it are too marked to be easily forgotten. Both of the illustrious disputants no doubt went too far; but we think the impartial will admit, that Philip was much more in the wrong than his opponent. Young, ardent, ambitious, and unscrupulous, the French monarch seemed to aim at nothing less than universal empire. He was the Napoleon of his day; and, like Napoleon, he dragged the Popes into captivity. He had embroiled himself in a struggle with England and with Aragon; and the consequence was an almost general war throughout Europe.

---

[1] He was elected Pope December 24, 1294, and died October 11, 1303. He was the successor of St. Cœlestine V

Boniface, treading in the footsteps of his predecessors, sought to pour oil on the boiling waters; and he offered to mediate between the belligerent sovereigns. He succeeded in bringing about a peace between France and Aragon; and his proffer of mediation between France and England, though at first declined, was at length accepted by the fiery French monarch. His award, though very wise and impartial,[1] was, however, contemptuously refused by the ambitious Philip; and the war raged on with renewed violence.

To raise the amount necessary to prosecute the war with vigor, Philip imposed most exorbitant taxes on both the clergy and laity of his kingdom; he reduced the church of France to a cruel servitude; and he even went so far as to debase the coin of the kingdom! Boniface protested against his iniquitous conduct, in the face of all Europe; he issued bull after bull against him; he waxed stronger and stronger in his denunciations; and finally, he excommunicated Philip, and placed France under an interdict. Philip treated his menaces and excommunication with contempt; and, though the bold Pontiff more than once evinced a disposition for an accommodation, he spurned all his offers. The states general of France were convened; and William de Nogaret, the keeper of the royal seals, was despatched to Rome with a strong protest against the proceedings of the Pope. This unscrupulous envoy seized on the person of Boniface at Anagni; and one of his attendants, Sciarra Colonna, a personal enemy of the Pontiff, is said to have struck him on the face with his gauntlet. Though rescued from the hands of his enemies by the people of Anagni, Boniface soon after died at Rome, probably of ill treatment and of chagrin.

Thus rid of his dread opponent, Philip did not, however, cease to persecute his memory. The better to effect his purpose of vengeance, he used every effort to have a successor elected who would enter into his own views. But at first he did not succeed to the full extent of his wishes. Benedict XI. was chosen by the cardinals; but, though he consented to modify some of the more obnoxious among the bulls of his predecessor, yet he would not, during the few months of his pontificate, consent to all the wishes of Philip.

On the death of this Pontiff, Philip brought every influence to bear on the conclave of cardinal electors; and the result was the election to the popedom of one among his own subjects, Bertrand d'Agoust, archbishop of Bordeaux, who took the name of Clement V. He was chosen on the 5th day of June, 1305; and, in accordance with the wishes of the French monarch, with whom he is said to have had a secret understanding, he took up his residence at Avignon in France.

---

[1] Gieseler, a Protestant, admits "that this decision was not partial." Text Book Eccles. Hist. vol. ii, p. 241. Note. American edition, in 3 vols. 8vo.

This was, in every respect, a most unfortunate step. It made the Popes entirely too dependent on France. It crippled their energies, and greatly diminished the sphere of their usefulness. Their acts were often viewed with suspicion by those belonging to other kingdoms; and, when France was at war with any other European power, the Pontiff was scarcely free to hold communication with its subjects. No one can read the history of the seven Popes who successively reigned at Avignon,[1] from 1305 to 1378, without being convinced of the evils consequent on this state of dependence, and without feeling that the Pontiff should be independent of all the sovereigns of Europe. Most of them were too much taken up with mere worldly business, and were too subservient to the interests of France; and a few of them,—as John XXII.,—were addicted to nepotism. With these exceptions, however, they were in the main good men; some of them were very exemplary. Benedict XII. in particular, won the esteem of all by his zeal and disinterestedness. He was wont to say, that a Pontiff should be, like Melchisedech, "without father, without mother, without genealogy."

When Clement V. determined to reside in France, it is not probable that he foresaw all the evils which would result from this step, or that his successors would imitate his example. He and they were still bishops of Rome, which they governed by their vicars. On his death, a long contest ensued in the conclave in regard to the choice of a successor. The two parties of the French and Italian cardinals, the mutual jealousy of which afterwards caused and perpetuated the Schism, already began to show themselves, in their strong antagonism. The Italians, however, gained the day; so far at least as to exact an oath from the newly elected Pontiff, that he would, without delay, return to Rome. John XXII., upon whom the choice fell, evaded or forgot the fulfillment of his promise.

His successors unfortunately imitated his example. The number of French soon exceeded that of the Italian cardinals in the conclave. French influence thus became paramount in the election of the Pontiffs; and the return of the Popes to their see seemed to be almost indefinitely postponed. Seventy-one years elapsed, ere the papacy could recover from the false and unnatural position, into which the intrigues of Philip the Fair and the pliant compliance of Clement V. had betrayed it.

Meantime, Rome, deprived of the presence and influence of its chief pastor, was desolate in its widowhood, and was torn by factions, caused by ambitious noblemen or demagogues striving for the mastery. Her voice of wailing was heard throughout Europe, and its sounds were most pathetic and emphatic at the gates of the pontifical palace at Avignon. Embassy after embassy was sent to implore the Pontiffs to return to their see. The eloquence of the great poet laureate, Petrarch, was enlisted in this noble cause. To its mere human accents was added a voice from heaven, calling back the Pontiff to his widowed church. The sainted women, Bridget of Sweden, Catharine, her daughter, and Catharine of Sienna, all approached the steps of the papal throne, adding to the eloquence of their sex and of the cause they pleaded, certain heavenly visions which they alleged had been vouchsafed them, all warning the Pontiff to return without delay to Rome.[1]

---

[1] Clement V., John XXII., Benedict XII., Clement VI., Innocent VI, Urban V., and Gregory XI. We could easily multiply quotations from the original sources to prove all the statements made above, did we not fear to cumber our margin too much with references.

At length Gregory XI. determined no longer to resist appeals so numerous and so touching. He left Avignon on the 13th of September, 1376; reached Rome on the 17th of January, 1377; and died there on the 27th of March, 1378. His death was the signal for that long and bitter struggle between the Italian and the French cardinals, between Italy and France, between Rome and Avignon, which originated and perpetuated the fatal Schism.

Of the sixteen cardinals, who had accompanied Gregory XI. to Rome, and on whom now devolved the task of choosing his successor, only four were Italians; eleven of the remaining twelve were Frenchmen, and one was a Spaniard. The French influence greatly predominated; and a Frenchman would, in all probability, have been elected, had not the Roman people assembled around the conclave in great numbers, and clamored vociferously,—"That a Roman, or at least an Italian, should be nominated." Urged by motives of prudence or of fear,[2] the cardinals acceded to the wishes of the people; and on the 9th of April, 1378, they selected a Neapolitan, Bartholomeo di Prignano, archbishop of Bari, who took the name of Urban VI. The vote was unanimous; and the cardinals, for more than four months, continued to acknowledge and to obey Urban as the lawfully appointed Pope.[3] During all this time, not a whisper is recorded to have been heard about the invalidity of Urban's election; not a word about the bodily fear which had seized on the electors, and trammeled their freedom.

But Urban VI., whom all writers concur in representing as an humble, pious, and disinterested man before his election, began soon afterwards to act with a vigor, and even harshness, which greatly astonished his electors.

---

[1] It is almost needless to remark that M. Bonnechose says not a word about all this preliminary history. Here, as frequently elsewhere, his brevity is evidently studied. It was enough for *his* philosophy, that the Schism really happened, no matter by what previous influences or train of events; and it was enough for *his* purpose to intimate that the ambition of the Popes had caused it! He knew, at least, that this flippant theory would satisfy the class of readers for whose tastes he catered.

[2] According to most of the French accounts (see I. et II. Vita Gregorii XI. apud Baluzium 1, 442 seqq. and Froissart's Chronicles,) the election was not free, but brought about by popular commotions and threats. But, according to the much more respectable and probable Italian accounts, the choice was entirely free, and the popular commotion occurred in consequence of a misunderstanding, *after* the election had been already made, (see Theod. de Niem, L. I. c. 2. Raynaldus ad Annum 1378 —also L'Enfant, Hist. Conc. Pis. I. 7, seq.)

[3] All grant this; even Leonardus Arretinus, Flavius Blondus, Platina, and other sharp writers against the Popes.

As Theodoricus de Niem tells us,[1] "he began to rebuke the bishops who flocked to Rome, calling them perjurers, because they had abandoned their churches." He then preached a sermon, "in which he openly reproved the vices of cardinals and prelates, which they took very ill."[2] The same author relates the following characteristic anecdote: "A certain collector of moneys for the apostolic chamber came, about that time, from a certain province into the presence of the said Urban, and offered him a small sum of money as a remuneration for his office of collector; to whom the Pontiff said: 'Thy money be with thee unto perdition;'—and he would not receive it."[3] He adds that Urban, by doing "things similar to this, from day to day, provoked against himself the anger of most of the cardinals and prelates;" and that the subsequent Schism "was caused more by the mutual rancor of the parties, than by the alleged fear in the election of Urban."[4]

We have been thus particular in our quotations from *de Niem,* because he is a great favorite with M. Bonnechose, who refers to him in this very place, but takes special care to suppress the testimonies which we have here supplied. He furnishes only a garbled quotation, to prove the tyranny of Urban, but he says nothing of the praiseworthy zeal which actuated the Pontiff. He can himself rebuke the pride and vices of cardinals and bishops; but if a Pope, in virtue of his office, dare do the same, his testimony must be suppressed, and all that need be said in the premises is, that he is a tyrant! Such is modern historic justice! Now, we have no doubt that Urban was a plain and blunt man, sincere in his zeal for the correction of abuses, but often harsh and indiscreet in the manner of enforcing obedience. The French cardinals could not brook his severity; they remembered the comparative ease and comfort they had enjoyed in their own country; and they determined at once to proceed to the election of a Pope who would be more pliant and accommodating to their wishes, and whom they might probably induce to accompany them back to France.

Accordingly, they left Rome under various pretexts, and met first at Anagni, and then at Fondi, where, after having issued a manifesto remarkable only for its violence and its utter recklessness of truth, they declared Urban an intruder into the papacy, and elected Clement VII. in his stead. Thus altar was set up against altar, and Pope against Pope! Europe was divided in its obedience between the two claimants. All Italy except Naples, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, England, Poland, and Prussia, declared for Urban; while France, Naples, Scotland, Savoy, Lorraine, and subsequently Castile, Aragon, and Navarra declared for Clement. The latter claimant soon betook himself to Avignon, where he placed himself entirely under the overshadowing influence of France.[2]

---

[1] De schismate, l. 1, c, 4. [2] Id. c. 5. [3] Ibid. [4] Id. c. 7.

[5] The chief difficulty in deciding between the two claimants, resulted from the different and contradictory statements of the partisans on both sides. However, the most famous jurists of the day, John di Lignano, papal vicar at Bologna, Baldus, professor in Perugia, and Jacobus de Sena, doctor Bonon. pronounced Urban's election valid. (See *Raynald.* ad Ann. 1378, and *Bulæus*, Hist. Univ. Paris.) St. Catharine of Sienna (ep. 31) expressed the greatest abhorrence for the revolted cardinals, whom she called dæmones humana carne induti—demons in human shape.

France might have extinguished the Schism at once, by refusing to recognize Clement; but she fostered and perpetuated it with all her might. It was through her influence that most of the kingdoms and provinces, which acknowledged Clement, were induced to do so. She sent her ambassadors every where, in order to extend the *obedience*[1] of the French Pope. She urged all kinds of political motives, to induce the various states of Europe to accede to her views; and she succeeded but too well in her purpose. She had too long tasted the political advantages accruing to her from the residence of the Popes at Avignon, to submit, without a struggle, to their being permanently located in their own proper see at Rome.

Thus political ambition perpetuated, as it had caused, the great Schism of the West. The Church was torn by schism, mainly through the intrigues of secular princes. The reckless ambition of Philip the Fair, had originally dragged the papacy into captivity at Avignon, as we have already seen; and the same reckless spirit now sought to renew and to perpetuate this unnatural exile,[2] at the expense of the peace and unity of Christendom. It was, indeed, a most deplorable state of things; a spectacle well calculated to draw tears from the eyes of every sincere lover of the Church. But was there no remedy for the evil?

There was; and that remedy came, under God, chiefly from France herself! This fact is as undoubted, as it is remarkable and honorable to the nation, which has well merited the title of *Most Christian;* and which has ever been the most efficient champion of the papacy in the hour of its greatest need. Had not the French university of Paris, the French clergy, and, through their entreaties and influence, finally the French government, thrown their influence in the scale of unity, we know of no *human* means by which the Great Schism would, or could have been healed.

Probably no other power in Europe could have effected this object: "Richard II., in England, and Charles VI., in France, were beginning their disastrous reigns;—in Spain, Italy, and Hungary, feeble or ferocious despots alternately rose or fell. On no throne was there seated a man capable of applying a remedy to the Schism, or of giving a salutary impulse to Europe. One could almost have said, that an open field had been left to the papal power, only that it might inflict on itself the most terrible wounds,—as if it were of so indestructible a nature that its ruin could only proceed from itself."[3]

Years rolled on; the Schism still continued, and Pontiff still succeeded Pontiff, both at Rome and at Avignon. The Church wept and sighed for unity; and the cardinals at each succeeding election were implored to terminate the Schism, by coalescing with those of the other claimant, or by some other effectual means. The means they usually adopted for this purpose proved very inadequate. It consisted in exacting of the newly elected Pope an oath,[1] that he would do everything in his power, and even, if necessary, that he would resign the popedom, to secure unity to the Church. But a compliance with this oath was evaded under one pretext or another; and the Schism still continued. There seemed to be no *human* remedy for it: it was like a circle which has no end. And this very comparison was adopted by a cotemporary French preacher, the famous *Pierre aux Bœufs*: —

---

[1] The territory which acknowledged and *obeyed* a Pope, during the period in question, was called by this name. For the active exertions of France in favor of Clement, see Prima Vita Clementis V. (in Baluzio I. 496 seqq.), and other cotemporary writers, *passim*.

[2] The Italians are in the habit of comparing the sojourn of the Popes at Avignon to the seventy years captivity of the Israelites in Babylon!

[3] Bonnechose, Historical Introduction, etc., p. 11. The result proved, we apprehend, that the papacy was indestructible, even by *itself*.

"To this circle do I liken the Schism, from the great similitude I perceive between them. Alas! does not the present Schism exhibit the form of a circle, in which can be found neither end nor outlet? Several others there have been, but they were only semi-circles, whereof the end could be found, and the issue arrived at. But in the present Schism we find neither bottom nor shore."[2]

In this conjuncture of affairs, the university of Paris stepped forth nobly to the rescue. Rendered illustrious by the talents and learning of the famous Peter d'Ailly,—"the eagle of France,"—and by those of his no less distinguished disciple, John Charlier Gerson, the university was then the first in Europe. Sustained by the French prelates and clergy, but often thwarted and baffled by the intrigues and chicanery of the French court, the university proceeded boldly and fearlessly to discuss the knotty question of the Schism, and to devise means for bringing it to a happy termination.

On the 6th day of June, 1394, fifteen years after the commencement of the Schism, this learned body promulgated its famous opinion, in which it recommended three methods of putting an end to the difficulty, and of securing peace to the Church: a resignation by the respective claimants, a compromise between them, or, both of these means failing, a general council to pronounce definitively on the whole merits of the question. The first method was most strongly recommended; the last was represented as a dernier resort, to remedy an otherwise incurable evil.[3] The university, at the same time, addressed a strong letter to Clement VII. at Avignon; who was not, however, much moved by its contents, and died soon afterwards.[4]

He was succeeded by the too famous Peter de Luna, who took the name of Benedict XIII. This man at first promised much, but in the end did nothing. To the earnest solicitations of the French national synod, convened at Paris in 1395, he returned an evasive answer. Disgusted with his tergiversation, France withdrew from his *obedience* in another national synod, held in 1398. Castile soon followed the example, and the refractory Pontiff was kept a close prisoner at Avignon. Every thing seemed then in a fair way for a general peace. But de Luna was as adroit as he was obstinate. He seemed to yield to the wishes of the French court, university, and clergy, and promised to do everything that was in his power to promote the unity of the Church: and France once more returned under his *obedience*.[1]

---

[1] This oath, in the case of at least one of the Avignon Popes, was rendered entirely nugatory by the condition annexed to it, that the resignation should take place whenever a majority of the cardinals should deem it necessary. As the pope could multiply the cardinals at will, this could scarcely ever be.

[2] Cited by Bonnechose, Introd. p. 13.

[3] See the opinion in full in Bulæus (Hist. Univ. Paris, tom. IV, p. 687 seq.) and in D'Achery, (Spicilegium, I, p. 776 seq.)

[4] It is reported that Clemens said of this letter, containing the opinion of the French university: "Literæ istæ malæ sunt et venenosæ — This letter is evil and poisonous."

Innocent VII., the second successor of Urban VI., the Roman claimant of the papacy, having made a similar promise at his election in 1404, negotiations were immediately opened between Rome and Avignon for the purpose of bringing about a compromise. These consumed much time, but ended in nothing. The failure caused general dissatisfaction; and France again threatened to withdraw from the *obedience* of Benedict XIII. Meantime, Angelo Corario, under the name of Gregory XII., had succeeded Innocent VII; and, impelled by the loud murmurs of France and of the whole Catholic world, Benedict and Gregory arranged a meeting to be held at Savona, in September, 1307. This meeting never took place: every expedient was, on the contrary, resorted to to consume time, and to prevent the interview.[2]

Disgusted with all this paltry manœuvering, as unworthy of both exalted personages, and so much at variance with their solemn promises, the cardinals on both sides abandoned them, met at Leghorn, and entered into an arrangement to call a general council at Pisa, in March, 1409, for the final settlement of the difficulty. The council met at the appointed time and place. There assisted at it about two hundred archbishops and bishops, besides twenty-four cardinals, and the ambassadors of all the principal European kingdoms.

> "Never," says M. Bonnechose, "had such an imposing assembly been seen in Europe, and never had any, from the number and quality of its members, been so justly entitled to claim the name of an œcumenical council."[3]

We humbly beg his pardon: this is much more flippant than true. The great council of Lateran, held at Rome under Innocent III., in 1215, was at least *twice* as large and imposing; and that of Vienne, held under Clement V., in 1311, numbered, according to Villani, three hundred bishops. Whether the Pisan Synod was strictly an œcumenical or general council, we venture not to decide, not do we deem it very important. It was convoked by neither claimant of the papacy, and its acts were strongly condemned by both, as might have been anticipated. Whether this defect was healed by the necessity of the emergency, or not, we cannot say. It was an extraordinary case; — such a one as had never occurred before, nor has ever happened since.[1]

---

[1] A. D. 1408.

[2] Leonardo Arrettino, a cotemporary, but a very sharp writer, and unsparing of the Popes, humorously describes these expedients, by saying that in arranging the place of meeting, Gregory seemed like a land animal which dreaded the water, and Benedict, like an aquatic animal which dreaded the land! (Apud Maratori—Scriptores Rerum Italic, tom. xix, p. 926.)

[3] P. 19.

The councils, guided by the counsels and eloquence of the two ablest men of the day, Peter D'Ailly, bishop of Cambray, and John Gerson, chancellor of the university of Paris, immediately cited both Pontiffs to appear before it; and, on their refusal to obey the summons, proceeded to depose them as contumacious and schismatical; and immediately elected in their place another, who took the name of Alexander V. After adopting some measures for the reform of existing abuses, the synod was dissolved by the newly elected Pontiff.

The two deposed Pontiffs now hurled their anathemas at the heads of those who had ventured to degrade them; and each of them still had, unhappily, some adherents. Spain and Scotland remained faithful to Benedict XIII., while Naples, and a few of the smaller states of Italy and Germany adhered to Gregory XII. Instead of two, the Christian world now had three claimants of the papacy! The council of Pisa thus left the Church in a more deplorable state than it had found her; and the Schism was destined yet to continue a few years longer, under still more aggravated circumstances.

This state of things could no longer be endured. The Church rose *en masse;* and the declaration went forth that the Schism must be terminated. A voice proceeded from the university of Paris, which was re-echoed throughout Christendom, that the Church must be reformed, "both in its head and in its members."[2] John XXIII, the successor of Alexander V., who was considered to have the best claims to the papacy, was compelled by the force of public opinion to convoke a general council at Constance. The council was opened, according to all the forms prescribed by law and usage, on the 5th of November, 1414. All were agreed that it was a general council.

It was soon perceived by the assembled fathers, that the only means of bringing about a permanent accomodation, was to induce or to compel all three of the claimants to resign, and then to proceed to the election of a new and undoubted Pope. A great difficulty arose at the very commencement of the deliberations, in regard to the authority of the council of Pisa, under the decrees of which John XXIII. claimed the papacy. After a long debate, it was decided that the matter should proceed as though the council of Pisa had never been held. John XXIII. was requested to resign; and fearing, it is said, an investigation into his moral character, which was none of the purest, he promised to do so, on the 2d of March, 1415. But nevertheless he fled[1] from Constance on the 21st of the same month; and the council, after a formal and regular investigation, pronounced against him the sentence of deposition on the 29th of May, of the same year. On the 4th of July following, Gregory XII. voluntarily tendered his resignation to the council.

---

[1] We believe the French writers more generally maintain that the Pisan council was a general one; and that the Italians defend the contrary proposition. By St. Antoninus and by Bellarmine it is set down as doubtful: nec approbatum nec improbatum, says Bellarmine; — though he inclines to the opinion that the Pontiff named by it and his successor were true Popes. (De Conciliis et Ecclesia, L. 1, c. 8.) It is not usually reckoned among the general councils by our standard writers.

[2] This famous saying, so current at that period, had reference to the unnatural state of the Schism, and to the moral and disciplinary disorders which had obtained, to a painful extent, both in the papal courts of Rome and Avignon, and among some of the cardinals, bishops, and inferior clergy. It had certainly no reference to doctrine, or to the spiritual supremacy and prerogatives of the Pontiff.

There yet remained one claimant, whom neither the entreaties nor the menaces of the council could move; whom all the influence of the emperor Sigismund could not turn from his purpose; whom the desertion of Spain in January, 1416, could not shake; who was determined to be Pope, even if all the world abandoned him, and he had no one left over whom he might exercise the papal authority! This man was Peter de Luna, calling himself Benedict XIII. Only one little Spanish town — Peniscola in Valentia — remained under his *obedience;* but the obstinate old man still held out! He thus verified what Maimbourg says of him: that "he was furiously obstinate, beyond all that might be expected even from an Aragonese."[2] Nor did he at all heed the sentence of deposition pronounced against him by the council of Constance, on the 26th of July, 1417.

Having thus, after nearly three years of patient labor and mature deliberation, disposed of the three claimants to the papacy, the council proceeded to the election of a new and undoubted Pope. On the 11th of November, 1417, the choice fell upon a noble Roman, Otto di Colonna, who took the name of Martin V. All minds and all hearts united on him; and his election was received with general joy and acclamations throughout Christendom. The great Schism was at an end: — for the obstinacy of Benedict XIII. gained him not one new proselyte, and he died — Pope of Peniscola — in 1424.[3]

Such is a summary history of the Great Schism of the west. We have endeavored to present the facts as we found them in the original records, without concealment, fear, or favor. We fear not, — we rather court the truth. Truth has never yet marred a good cause, nor materially served a bad one. If the facts had been a hundred-fold worse than they were, we would not have feared to state them fully, plainly, and without any disguise.

And now, we would ask, what does the history of the Great Schism prove? The first thing it proves to our minds, is, that the Church and the papacy are alike indestructible and imperishable. Both the Church and the papacy came out of the Schism, much stronger than they went into it! The result fully proved that, even in the darkest hour of her history, — when all boded division, destruction, death, — there was a certain divinely reactive energy in both the Church and the papacy, which caused both to ride the storm in safety, and to triumph gloriously over a combination of evil elements, which would have destroyed any merely human institution. The previous history of the Church had proved, that she could triumph over external persecution and internal heresy in all their most hideous and multiform assaults; this sad chapter in her annals proved that she could conquer a more dangerous enemy still,—a long and inveterate Schism rending her very bosom, and preying upon her very vitals for nearly forty years! The experiment was fairly and fully made, under circumstances, too, the most unfavorable to her, and its result has been her signal and permanent triumph. Surely such an institution as this must be of divine origin!

---

[1] He fled more than once.

[2] Histoire du Grand Schisme, Liv. iii, p. 236.

[3] He left four Cardinals, three of whom elected a Clement VIII. as his successor; the fourth, a Benedict XIV! Verily, the disciples were worthy of their master!

Nor let us be told that, during the Schism, the boasted unity and infallibility of the Church were at an end. Unity of faith, of worship, and even, in a certain sense, of government, was preserved, even in the midst of the Schism. Those belonging to different *obediences* did not disagree in doctrine, even on the smallest article; they worshipped at the same altars, and in the same way; they all subscribed to the same doctrine, that the Pope, as the successor of St. Peter, is the divinely appointed visible head of the Church on earth. They merely differed on a question of *fact*—which was the true and lawful Pope, or which had been regularly and canonically elected? And so soon as this matter of fact could be examined and decided on by the proper authority, the doubt ceased and all immediately acknowledged and paid homage to the undoubted Pontiff.

That this fact could be, and was, definitely settled, is another proof of the divine wisdom with which the Church was organized by her founder. Until it could be determined, Catholics might, without compromising any doctrine or principle, safely follow their ordinary guides, and yield obedience to the individual, whom in their conscience they believed to possess the best claims to the papacy.[1]

To make good their position, the adversaries of the Catholic church should prove that, during the Schism, there was a change effected in the doctrines universally received and held by the Church, before its commencement; or they ought to show, at least, that some of the old doctrines were called in question. But can they establish this? Can they point to the bold innovator, whether Pope, bishop, or professor, who ventured to take this stand? We defy them to do so. The truth is, the Schism left *all* the doctrines, as well as the discipline, of the Church intact, and just where it found them.

Nor is the contrary of this proposition established by the admitted fact that, during the period in question, and for some time afterwards, long and animated controversies were carried on in the Church itself concerning the relations of Popes to general councils; the Italians maintaining the pre-eminence of the Popes, the French that of the general councils. The controversy was carried on under extraordinary circumstances, when there were two or three claimants of the tiara at a time; and the assertion, by the council of Constance, of the superiority of a general council over the Pope, could have contemplated none other than this anomalous state of things. A *doubtful* pope might certainly be brought under the action of the council; otherwise there could be no remedy for the Schism.

---

[1] It was a maxim current in those troubled times, that "a doubtful pope is no pope"—*Papa dubius est papa nullus;*—which could only mean that none but an undoubted pope could claim an undoubted obedience, and the consequent prerogatives of the papacy.

Except in its application to this extraordinary case, the whole controversy was really one of words, rather than about the substance. It was agreed on all hands that a council could not represent the *whole* church, nor therefore be general, without the concurrence and sanction, either present or subsequent, of an undoubted Pope; and the controversy, if it contemplated a council, with this condition essential to its œcumenicity, amounted merely to the question, whether the Pope and council together were superior to the Pope alone! Even during the fiercest excitement of the Schism, Catholics were *unanimous* in admitting the infallible authority of a general council sanctioned by the Pontiff; — and this was all that the Catholic Church ever taught on the subject, as an article of faith. Thus there was really no controversy among Catholics on any article of faith, or on any thing necessarily connected with one, even during the Schism.

The adversaries of the papacy have greedily seized upon the fact, that during several years there were rival claimants to the chair of Peter, to show that the line of succession of the Roman Pontiffs was interrupted or broken. The fact does not at all warrant this conclusion. In the first place, it is highly probable, if not morally certain, from the facts already stated above, that the Roman line, which began with and succeeded Urban VI., comprised the only rightful claimants to the succession. The election of Urban was recognized as regular and lawful by the whole Church, and by the cardinal electors themselves, for more than four months after it had taken place. The plea of want of liberty in the choice, seems to have been an afterthought of the French cardinals, and it was so regarded by De Niem.[1] Even after the Schism had been consummated by the setting up of a rival claimant at Avignon, the great majority of Christendom continued in the obedience of Urban.

But, in the second place, the integrity of the succession is not affected, even in the improbable hypothesis, that the claims of the two rival lines at Rome and Avignon are equally balanced, and that it remains doubtful which was the lawful Pope. Even in this case, one or the other was certainly the rightful incumbent: and it matters not which, so far as the substance of the succession is concerned. If Urban was the lawfully elected Pontiff, Clement certainly was not; and *vice versa*. The line of Roman Pontiffs remained unbroken in either hypothesis. The doubt affected persons, but not the thing itself. The objection then falls to the ground; and the boasted argument, alleged by the enemies of the papal succession, will not bear the slightest test of logic.

Still more puerile is the objection against the succession, based on the fact, that for about seventy years the Popes resided at Avignon. During all this period, they were universally recognized, and they constantly acted through their vicars, as Bishops of Rome. The holding of an office does not require residence in the incumbent, when he can otherwise discharge the duties annexed. The matter of residence is one of discipline, more or less important; it is not indispensably connected with the episcopal office, much less can it affect the papal succession.

---

[1] Quoted above.

Both these objections are predicated on superficial or erroneous ideas of the subject. They will not bear logical scrutiny. They vanish before the first touch of logic, as mists before the rising sun.

Protestant historians are unanimous in painting the moral condition of the Church as truly frightful and appalling, during the continuance of the Schism. We do not deny that there were, at that time, some grievous abuses and wide-spread disorders. We freely admit, and we weep over these scandals. They were deplored and sternly rebuked by the greatest and best men of the time; the great body of the bishops, and the Church at large, never approved of them;—no, not for one moment. The various national synods of France, and the councils of Pisa and Constance, not only condemned these evils, but they adopted wise and strong resolutions to remedy them, and to reform the Church "in its head and in its members." The Church is surely not fairly responsible for scandals which she deplored, over which she wept, which she took every possible means to prevent and to remove, and which she did effectually abolish.

But every impartial man will admit that there exists much exaggeration on this subject. During those dreadful times men's minds were greatly excited, and their blood boiled with honest indignation at the desecration of holy things, which they were daily called on to witness. Hence they wrote strongly, and often in a tone of hyperbole and exaggeration. Their invectives against vice and scandal were commensurate with their love for the Church. Even the great Gerson often exaggerated, and sometimes dealt in declamation and open extravagances. His preceptor, the illustrious Peter D'Ailly, archbishop of Cambray, though more cool and judicious, was likewise occasionally betrayed into ultraism. And as to persons of less intellect, sanctity, and standing in the Church,—such as Theodoricus de Niem, Nicholas de Clemangis, Leonardo Aretino, Cramaud, and others,—they wrote and spoke under the evident influence of strong excitement and passion. No one can open their works without coming to this conclusion. The adherents and partisans of the different papal claimants naturally spoke with great harshness and bitterness of those belonging to the opposite party: they often seized upon malicious rumors and published them as facts: local they magnified into general disorders: in a word, their imagination was fired, and their passions inflamed, and their statements are to be received with many grains of allowance. The evils growing out of the Schism were bad enough—*they* made them appear much worse than they really were.

But, exaggerated as is the history of those times, drawn by the cotemporaries to whom we have just alluded, such modern writers as Bonnechose make the picture a hundred fold darker, by disingenuously accumulating only those extracts from cotemporary writers which portray evils and scandals, and studiously leaving out those which speak of eminent virtues, of edifying examples, and of touching incidents. They put to the lips of their readers only the bitterest ingredients — the very dregs — of the cup of history; they allow them to sip none of its cooling and refreshing waters. And they even cut up and garble the passages, which they profess to give entire and continuous! M. Bonnechose, as we have proved, makes a practice of doing this.

If he wished to tell the whole truth, and to be a historian indeed, why not furnish his readers the facts on both sides of the question? Why not inform them that, if there were great vices, there were also signal virtues, during the Schism? Why not, at least, drop a hint that there were great, and good, and holy men and women, in great numbers too, and pre-eminent in merit and sanctity, during that whole unfortunate period? Why omit entirely the name of the great apostle of that era,— of the Paul, and the Francis Xavier of the fourteenth century,— of the great, the eloquent, the sainted thaumaturgus, St. Vincent Ferrer? Why not say a word of the holy Catharines and Bridgets? Why omit all mention of many others, similarly distinguished?

The truth is, that the moral disorders which prevailed to a considerable extent during the Schism, instead of proving aught against the sanctity or infallibility of the Church, or against the authority and rightful prerogatives of the papacy, prove precisely the contrary. They may be fairly traced to the unnatural and anomalous condition of the Church, growing out of the distracted condition of the papacy, the great directing and conservative principle of the Christian religion. Had the papacy not been divided, had it remained untrammeled and unchecked in its influence, those disorders would, in all probability, never have occurred, or they would have occurred in a much milder and more mitigated form. If the Church was so much injured by the crippling of the papacy during not quite forty years, what would have been her condition had the papacy been entirely and permanently destroyed? And what would *now* be her state, without this great conservative element in her organization?

We repeat it, the moral disorders consequent on the great Schism of the west present to our minds the strongest proof of the great utility, nay, of the absolute necessity, of the papacy, as an element of Church government!

This naturally leads us to notice a popular objection, or rather cavil, which is usually stated somewhat in this way: If the Church could do without the papacy for forty, why not for two thousand years? The answer is very plain. We deny both the antecedent and the conclusion,— the fact assumed, and the inference thence drawn.

During the Schism, the papacy existed, though the territory over which it held jurisdiction was divided. All maintained the *necessity* of a visible head of the Church, and of but one head, or chief executive; hence the struggles of the contending parties for the mastery; hence the continued efforts of all the good to find some way of escaping from the Schism. At no period of the Church's history was the importance and necessity of the papacy more clearly recognized or more deeply felt. All acknowledged the obligation of obedience to the Pope; all bowed down before the principle; the only difference was in regard to a matter of fact, which the passions of men had rendered for a time obscure.

But even admit the antecedent,— that the church did do without the papacy for forty years,—the conclusion,—that therefore it could do without it for two thousand,— would not follow. This is a fallacy, which logicians call "reasoning from particulars to generals;" and it has about as much weight as this parallel sophism: A man may do without food for one day; therefore he may do without it for forty years!

The same fallacy lurks under another popular objection, which we may as well also briefly notice. It is this: If the council of Constance, convened and presided over by no undoubted Pope, could settle the affairs of the Church without papal authority, where is the need of the papacy at all?

We test the validity of this reasoning, by putting a parallel case. Suppose the contingency should arise,— and it is certainly a possible case,— that a presidential election in our republic should turn out to be of doubtful issue, and that each of the two great political parties should claim that its candidate was duly elected. After much political agitation, and various attempts at adjustment, the matter comes before congress for final adjudication. It is settled, we further suppose, by requiring both the claimants to resign, and ordering a new election. All parties acquiesce in this wise arrangement, and the political schism is at an end. Now suppose further that some political wiseacre should rise up, and cry out: "What is the use of having a president at all? If congress can regulate affairs without him, why not abolish his office altogether." No sensible man would deem anything more than a smile necessary as an answer to such reasoning.

Why is it that men, usually so shrewd in temporal matters, become apparently almost bereft of the reasoning faculty, when it is a question of assailing the Catholic Church, and the papacy? The Church and the papacy after having braved the storms and revolutions of eighteen centuries, can surely emerge triumphantly from the ordeal of such logic as this! The fact that the enemies of the Church are driven to use such arguments as these, furnishes a clear evidence, that, even in their own estimation, their cause is as weak as that of the Church is strong. If the Church and the papacy had not both been the work of God, they never could have passed through so many difficulties and vicissitudes unharmed.

There can be no doubt, that, as we said above, the papacy came out of the Schism much stronger than it went into it. It went into it trammeled with political importance, and worldly grandeur, which impaired the energies and dimmed the splendors of its spiritual character. It came out of it in a great measure rid of these incumbrances: shorn of a great portion of these *accidental* trappings, but indued, more strongly than ever, with the impenetrable panoply of its own spiritual strength. Christendom now revered and loved it more than ever: it was more in conformity with its primitive type; it had returned to its original position in the world. It was tried by the Schism, as by a fiery ordeal. It emerged unscathed, and more pure, radiant, and vigorous than ever. The "wood and stubble" of its earthly pomp and wordly-mindedness were consumed by the fire; but "the gold, silver, and precious stones" of its spiritual power and heavenly strength yet remained. It suffered loss indeed, but itself "was saved yet so as by fire."[1]

---

[1] 1 Corinth, iii, 12--15.

X. JOHN HUSS AND THE HUSSITES.

THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.*

New trials lead to new triumphs of the Church—Character of John Huss—A traitor in the camp—Seeking popularity—Wickliffe and his doctrines—These necessarily lead to civil commotions—Translated into Bohemia—University of Prague—The German and Bohemian students—Carthaginian hatred of Rome—Writers on Huss and his disciples—Persecution no Catholic tenet—Imperial laws on the subject—What were the doctrines of Huss?—And what their influence on society?—What means did he adopt to spread them?—Was he consistent?—Had he a fair trial at Constance?—Was the council cruel towards him?—Were the fathers guilty of breach of faith?—Keeping faith with heretics—Case of Jerome of Prague—Horrible excesses of the Hussites—Ziska "of the Cup"—Pillage, murder, and sacrilege—A horrid martial instrument of music—A dark and bloody monument to the memory of Huss.

In the very midst of the great western schism — when all Christendom was overspread with gloom and desolation,— and when, humanly speaking, the very existence of the Church itself seemed to be menaced; — a dark and threatening cloud gathered in Bohemia, and soon burst upon her, in one of the most terrific storms that she had ever experienced during the long course of her history. Torn and distracted *within*, she was, at the same time, fiercely assailed by a bold and truculent heresy from *without;* as if Divine Providence, in permitting these dreadful evils to fall simultaneously upon her, had meant to make trial of her strength, and to prove triumphantly to the world her innate stability and indestructibility.

With every odds against her; with her energies divided and broken; with the papacy — the great controlling and conservative element of her government — itself seemingly in jeopardy; she was still to behold her all-conquering banner wave in triumph over all her enemies, both external and internal; and she was to witness, in this her signal triumph, one more conclusive proof, in addition to the thousand which her history had already afforded, that Christ was still faithful to His solemn pledge,— "the gates of hell SHALL NOT prevail against her."

The annals of the world tell of few men more remarkable than *John Huss*. The forerunner of Martin Luther and John Calvin, he united the boldness and indomitable energy of the former, with the coolness and fierce malignity of the latter; while he, perhaps, surpassed both in firmness and obstinacy of purpose. Born of poor and obscure parentage, in the small village of Hussinecz in Bohemia, in the year 1373, we find him, in his thirtieth year, a professor in the famous university of Prague, confessor of the queen of Bohemia, and preacher at the chapel of Bethlehem.[1] Bold, energetic, talented, and sprightly, he soon rose to distinction, and acquired an almost unbounded popularity. As professor, he fascinated the youth who flocked to his lectures by the boldness of his views, and the startling novelty of his theories. As confessor to the queen, he exercised great influence over her mind, and over that of her weak and imbecile husband, Wenceslaus; and he became all powerful at court. As a popular preacher, he had few rivals, and no superior, in all Bohemia.

---

*An introduction to "D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation." The Reformers before the Reformation. The Fifteenth century. John Huss and the council of Constance. By Emile de Bonnechose, librarian of the king of France, author of "Histoire de France," "Histoire Sacrée," &c. Translated from the French by Campbell McKenzie, B. A., Trinity College, Dublin. Complete in one volume, 8vo., pp 199. New York: Harper & Brother, 1844.

Such was the man who was soon to rear the standard of revolt against the Church, to maintain doctrines subversive of social order, both civil and religious, and to light up in Bohemia a flame, which was to be extinguished only in the blood of thousands of its citizens! Had he continued faithful to the truth; had he devoted his life and talents to the cause of religion and social order; had he studied to allay, instead of exciting, the elements of discord already fermenting in the minds of men, and especially in those of his fierce and semi-barbarous countrymen, he might have been one of the brightest ornaments of his age and nation, and one of the strongest pillars of the Church. As a priest of the Catholic Church, he had, at the holy altar, solemnly plighted his faith to become, and to continue her advocate and faithful champion until death: — her cause was his cause; her truth his truth; her joys were his joys; and her sorrows were his sorrows. If ever she needed a champion, now was that time; if ever she needed a comforter in her grief, this was the season.

But alas! instead of comforting her, and laboring to assuage her grief, in this the most bitter hour of her affliction, this sworn minister of her altars, who had broken bread with her in unity and in sweetness of communion, now basely deserted her, and treacherously lifted up his heel against her holy sanctuary! He preferred the ephemeral popularity attending the advocacy of bold and startling novelties, to that less brilliant and enticing, but more solid and permanent glory, which results from the humble and unostentatious championship of old and uninviting, but wholesome truths. Like many other men of great talent and genius, but seduced by secret pride, he preferred the fame which attaches to the founder of a new sect, to that which he might have acquired by pursuing the even tenor of his way, and doing much good, in a quiet manner, in the venerable old paths of truth, marked out and hallowed by the footsteps of his sainted forefathers in the faith.

He wished, in a word, to become in Bohemia, what Wickliffe had so recently been in England. The bold English reformer — the redoubtable captain of the Lollards, — had died quietly and in peace[2] in the year 1384, in his own rectory of Lutterworth; but, in dying, he had bequeathed a fatal legacy to posterity in his writings.[1] These abounded with virulent attacks upon the ministry, doctrines, and institutions of the Catholic Church, — of which Wickliffe was nevertheless a priest, — and with principles as new as they were pernicious.

---

[1] Founded in the year 1391 by two wealthy citizens of Prague, Johann Von Muhlheim and the merchant Kreus; and destined especially for the preaching of the gospel to the poor.

[2] In spite of all the alleged cruelty and persecuting spirit of the Catholic Church.

Many of his assertions were downright blasphemies against the Deity; such as those of his propositions which asserted absolute predestination and fatality, and, among the rest, this atrocious one — "God ought to obey the devil!"[2] Many of them consisted of bitter and baseless tirades against the clergy and the Popes: such as that which designated "the Roman Church a synagogue of Satan;"[3] and those which stigmatized as heretics, all clergymen who held any species of property, as well as those who bestowed it on them.[4] Others railed against the monastic orders as "diabolical and unchristian;"[5] and against colleges and universities, as "pagan in their origin" and "devilish" in their tendencies.[6] Others, in fine, openly broached and defended doctrines directly subversive of all social order, both in Church and state; such as those which maintained that a bishop and a civil magistrate lost all power and jurisdiction, the moment they fell into grievous sin![7] This last may be reckoned the distinctive doctrine of Wickliffe's whole system; the one to which the civil commotions and bloodshed subsequently caused by his disciples, the Lollards, are fairly traceable.

Such were the leading features of that iniquitous system, which was now to be transplanted from England into Bohemia, and to produce in the latter country the same bitter and poisonous fruits which it had brought forth in the former. A noble Bohemian, Jerome Faulfish, more commonly known as Jerome of Prague, had visited the famous university of Oxford, in England, for the purpose of completing his education. There he became acquainted with the writings of Wickliffe, which he perused with avidity and delight. On his return to Bohemia, about the year 1402, he brought several copies of them with him, and busily circulated them among the professors and students of the university of Prague. Thoroughly imbued himself with the doctrines of the English apostate, he labored with unremitting zeal to infuse his own convictions into the minds of others. He succeeded but too well in his purpose!

The university of Prague was divided and thrown into confusion. A rivalry had long existed in its halls between the German professors and students, and those of Bohemia: but hitherto the Germans had maintained the ascendency, both in numbers and in influence. The tables were now turned. John Huss adopted and defended with great vigor the doctrines of Wickliffe, and was soon followed by nearly all the Bohemians belonging to the university; the Germans as ardently maintained the old principles of religion and philosophy, and denounced the new opinions as both heretical and ruinous in their tendency. Novelty, however, gained the day; the Germans were expelled from the university, John Huss and his adherents became supreme therein, and they were thus enabled to teach and to spread their new-fangled notions, almost without opposition.[1]

---

[1] The worst of these was his *Trialogus*, written after his retirement from Oxford to Lutterworth, and shortly before his death. It embodies, in the form of a conference among three persons, all his virulence, all his distinctive doctrines, and all the worst features of his system.

[2] Deus debet obedire diabolo. — Prop. vi, among those condemned by the council of Constance.

[3] Prop. xxxvii, ibid. [4] Prop. xxxvi. [5] Prop. xxiii and xxxi. [6] Prop. xxix.

[7] Prop. xv, Nullus est dominus civilis, nullus est prælatus, nullus est episcopus, dum est in peccato mortali.

The infection soon spread throughout Bohemia. The ignorant and the vicious were pleased with the new doctrines, and were fascinated with the boldness and eloquence of the man who poured forth, in his own chapel of Bethlehem, and throughout the kingdom, his coarse and withering invectives against the Popes, the bishops, and the clergy. The standard of revolt was now raised; and all Bohemia was in a flame. The dreadful sequel is but too well known.

It is fashionable with such writers as M. Bonnechose to praise extravagantly, and to exalt even to the skies, men who,—like John Huss,—fiercely opposed the Catholic Church, and raised altar against altar. We are not at all surprised at this. Men naturally sympathize with those of a kindred spirit. No matter how wicked the founders of new sects may have been; no matter how reckless, inconsistent, and unprincipled; no matter what commotion they excited, what hatred they stirred up, what torrents of blood they caused to flow; if they only opposed Rome, all their iniquities are at once forgiven and forgotten, and they are painted as saints, as heroes, as martyrs, as men who preferred the voice of their conscience to all the smiles of the Church and of the world! This fierce and more than Carthagenian hatred of Rome, like the mantle of charity, covers a multitude of sins. John Huss and Jerome of Prague are represented as men entirely in advance of their age; as men who had the courage to rebuke the vices and errors of a corrupt and all-powerful church; as men who fell victims to their noble zeal and integrity, and to the vengeance of the hierarchy!

M. Bonnechose evidently follows the accounts most favorable to Huss and the Hussites.[2] If he examined at all the authorities on the other side, his readers are in a great measure deprived of the fruits of his researches. If he sometimes quotes Æneas Sylvius and John Cochlœus, it is rather to keep up a semblance of impartiality, or to confirm some statement in favor of Huss, than to exhibit fairly and fully the facts and evidence on both sides. When his favorite partisan work — "the History and Monuments of John Huss and Jerome of Prague," — fails him, he calls in to his aid the veracious John Fox, the English martyrologist, whom he quotes with as much complacency, as if he had been a cotemporary historian, and as if he had never written accounts of the cruel deaths and martyrdom of *living* men. Such is the general character of M. Bonnechose's work, which, with some pretensions to erudition and impartiality, is a production as thoroughly partisan as ever was written. We think no candid man who reads it, and compares its statements with those of the original historians, can come to any other conclusion.

---

[1] We have gathered these particulars from a distinguished cotemporary, *Æneas Sylvius* — Historia Bohemorum, c. 35. He says that the Bohemians were then "by nature ferocious and indomitable — natura ferocibus atque indomitis." He adds that Wickliffe's new doctrines were spread by Huss, chiefly with a view to vex the German professors, and to oust the Germans from the university — "Wyclevitarum doctrinam arripuit eaque Teutonicos vexare magistros cœpit, sperans eo confusos Teutones scholas relicturos."

[2] The chief authorities on the history of John Huss and the Hussites are the following: In favor of John Huss, a voluminous work, composed by an *anonymous* Hussite, and entitled: Historia et monumenta Jo. Huss atque Hieronymi Pragensis — Norimbergæ: 1715, tom. ii, in folio. This work is a special favorite with M. Bonnechose, who quotes it on all occasions. Against Huss; *Æneæ Sylvii* — De Bohemorum origine ac gestis historia, (Romæ: 1475, fol.), especially chaps. 35 and 36; and *Johannes Cochlæus* — Historia Hussitarum, Libri xii. (Moguntiæ: 1549, folio.) To these add a host of more recent writers, especially in Germany, chiefly in favor of Huss; such as *Theobaldus* — De Bello Hussitarum, in 4to; *Wilhelmi Seyfridi* — De Jo. Huss martyris vita, fatis, ac scriptis, Jenæ: 1729, etc.; *J. F. W. Fischer*, life of Jerome of Prague, and Zitte's life of Huss, both written in German. See also *Labbæi* Concilia — Concil. Constant.; *Hardt* — Constant. Concilium, &c., vi, tom. folio; *L'Enfant* — Histoire du Concile de Constance, tom. ii; and *Castenet* — Nouvelle Hist du Concile de Constance, Paris: 1718, 4to.

We are sincerely opposed to all persecution. Catholics have been too long and too cruelly the victims of it, to relish it; no matter by what specious reasoning or pretext its advocates may have sought to palliate or justify it in any particular case. The sentence of death pronounced and executed on John Huss and Jerome of Prague was much more the result of the spirit of the times in which the deed was done, than of that of the Church: it was the consequence of imperial, rather than of ecclesiastical, enactments. All this we hope to make appear in the sequel, by such a mass of evidence as the candid inquirer can neither resist nor answer.

The Catholic Church has never persecuted, as a Church, for mere conscience sake. She has, indeed, at all times freely and fearlessly exercised her undoubted prerogative of proclaiming the truth, and of stigmatizing error; of witnessing and authoritatively pronouncing on the "faith once delivered to the saints." She had been instituted for this express purpose; and well and fully has she fulfilled her mission. No matter how adverse the circumstances under which she labored; no matter what clouds and storms gathered around her pathway; she was, at all times, too thoroughly imbued with the meek and humble spirit of her divine Founder and Spouse, to call down fire on the heads of her enemies. She could suffer without a murmur; she could not witness, much less inflict suffering on others, without a pang. Her whole history through eighteen long centuries, if impartially examined and fairly stated, will fully bear out this view of the subject.

Nor does the case of John Huss and Jerome of Prague constitute an exception to this general remark. Their melancholy death, as we have already intimated, was the result of imperial laws, not of Church decisions. It was the emperor Sigismund, and not the fathers of the council of Constance, who sentenced them to death. The council merely condemned the doctrines of Huss, ordered the books containing them to be burnt,[1] and deposed him from the ministry as an unworthy and heretical priest;[2] it was the emperor Sigismund who condemned him to death, in accordance with the settled law of the Germanic empire.

[1] Those who affect to be scandalized at this are referred to the example of St. Paul, who caused a multitude of bad books to be burnt at Ephesus — Acts, ch. xix.

[2] M. Bonnechose himself is forced virtually to grant this. See p. 102, where he gives the substance of the two sentences pronounced by the council.

Even M. Bonnechose, how much soever he strives to implicate the council,[1] is still constrained to admit this. He tells us that the emperor, at the close of Huss's examination before the council, irritated at the obstinacy of the man, whom neither he nor the council could induce to retract, thus addressed the assembled fathers in his presence:

> "You have heard the errors which this man has taught — many of which are crimes deserving of the severest punishment. *My opinion, therefore, is*, that, unless he abjures every one of them, he ought to be burned to death. . . . . If any of his followers should happen to be at Constance, they ought also to be severely put down, and chiefly, amongst them all, his disciple Jerome."[2]

As we shall see in a passage to be cited hereafter, he had pronounced a similar opinion at the opening of the examination.

For nearly two hundred years before the council of Constance, it had been a settled and organic law of the Germanic empire, that heresy was punishable with death. At the famous convention held at Roncaglia, in Italy, in the year 1158, the emperor Frederic Barbarossa had revived the provisions of the old Roman imperial laws, as modified and acted on by the first Christian emperors. He had revived them with all their absolutism and all their persecuting spirit. His grandson, Frederic II, went still farther. In the year 1244, he added specific and terrible laws against heretics. In the new code, blasphemy and heresy were put on a level with high treason; and, like it, were to be punished with death. It was thought by the law that heresy was rebellion and high treason against heaven; and that a man who was a traitor to his God, could not be a faithful subject to his earthly sovereign.

The Church had at least no direct agency in enacting this odious code. She seems to have merely acquiesced in its enactment. She could not, in fact, have well done otherwise; for the two Frederics were men of stern and inflexible resolve; — tyrants whom no influence could either tame or control. During the time of the early Christian emperors, the Church had often been herself the victim of a similar stern and grasping legislation. She had seen her best Pontiffs and bishops dragged into exile, and condemned to death by the iron will of imperial tyrants, who took it upon themselves to decide what was truth, and what was heresy, and to enforce their decision with terrible penalties.[3]

The condemnation to death, then, of John Huss and Jerome of Prague at Constance, was no new thing. It was done in accordance with a settled principle of law, long established and generally recognized. No one questioned its existence, or doubted its justice, either at that time, or for many centuries afterwards; not even those who fell victims to its exercise. All the early reformers adopted and defended the self same principle; and the punishment by death at the stake, for heresy, was retained in Protestant England longer than in any other country in the world.[1]

---

[1] Many of his assertions on this subject need confirmation, other than his own bare word, and that of his partial authorities.

[2] P. 96.

[3] Witness the cases of the Pontiffs Liberius, Silverius and St. Martin I.; and of the holy prelates, St. Hilary, of Poictiers; St. Athanasius, of Alexandria; St. John Chrysostom, of Constantinople, and of many others.

Even John Huss himself, as we shall show more fully in the sequel, was not only well aware of the existence of this law, ere he departed from Prague for Constance, but he freely consented to be judged by it, and to abide its penalty, if convicted of heresy. At Constance itself, on being accused of having denied its justice, he repelled the accusation, and only remarked: "the heretic cannot be corporeally punished, until after he has been charitably instructed, by means of arguments drawn from Scripture:"[2] a qualification which, with the exception of its implying the right of private interpretation in opposition to Church authority, few would have felt disposed to question, even in that stern age. The Church may, then, say in reference to the death of Huss and Jerome:—*Non mea culpa est, sed temporum.* It was not *her* fault that they died at the stake; the sacrifice was made in accordance with the jurisprudence of the age.

But before we can subscribe to the opinion that Huss was a saint and a martyr, and that the council of Constance acted a cruel and treacherous part by him, we must have more evidence than the bare word of such flippant writers as M. Bonnechose, and the partisan historians whom he quotes. We must go into the whole merits of the case, and examine the following previous questions:

1st. What were the doctrines of John Huss, and what were their effects on society?

2d. What means did he adopt to spread them?

3d. Was he always equally bold in avowing, and consistent in maintaining them?

4th. Had he a fair trial at Constance?

5th. Did the council act with wanton cruelty in his regard?

And 6th. Was the council guilty of perfidy and treachery towards him?

We shall endeavor briefly and succinctly, but, we hope, clearly and satisfactorily, to answer all these questions. And we will assert nothing which cannot be clearly proved from undoubted and original sources, cotemporary with the events themselves.

I. What were the doctrines of John Huss, and what were their effects on society?

His doctrines were the same as those of Wickliffe, of which we have already spoken; with this important difference, however, that the Bohemian does not appear to have gone so far as the English reformer. Huss admitted to the day of his death many distinctive doctrines of Catholicity which Wickliffe had rejected: such as the real presence, the sacrifice of the mass, the power of granting indulgences, and some others. But, in all other respects, he seems to have agreed almost entirely with Wickliffe, though he was, perhaps, less furious, and more cautious, in expressing his opinions, than the bluff and sour Englishman. Like him, he railed incessantly against the Popes, the bishops, the clergy, the religious orders; like him, he maintained the doctrine of absolute predestination; like him, he believed that none but the elect belonged or could belong to the Church of Christ; like him, he maintained that it was unlawful for the clergy to hold property of any kind; like him, he denied the infallibility of the Church; and, like him, he asserted the ruinous principle,— ruinous to all social organization, whether political or religious,— that the circumstance of a temporal or spiritual ruler being in the state of mortal sin, deprived him, by the very fact, of all power and jurisdiction.[1]

---

[1] Instances of this cruel punishment occur in England as late as the reign of George the I.! See Fletcher's notes to De Maistre's "Letters on the Spanish Inquisition."

[2] Bonnechose, p. 94.

He also openly denied the power of the Church to excommunicate or to suspend her ministers, and boldly defended the disorganizing doctrine, that a priest thus excommunicated, provided he believed the sentence unjust, could still continue to exercise his functions, in spite of the prohibition by the ecclesiastical tribunal. He more than once intimated that St. Peter never had been the head of the Church; that the Roman Pontiffs had derived their supremacy from the Cæsars; and that there was no need of a visible head of the Church on earth. That such were the distinctive doctrines of Huss, we think no one who has at all read the original documents will be disposed to deny.[2]

Who can wonder, that doctrines so thoroughly disorganizing should have produced the most disastrous effects on society? Who can wonder that Prague soon became the theatre of bitter contentions, of civil commotions, of infuriate mobs, of bloodshed? Who can wonder that all Bohemia was thrown into convulsions; that its hills and valleys were crimsoned with the blood of its own citizens; that a civil war, the most obstinate and bloody, perhaps, recorded in the annals of history, tore and lacerated its bosom, and sent tens of thousands of its citizens to the tomb?

All these terrible disasters were as natural and necessary results of the preaching and doctrines of John Huss, as fruits are of the tree which bears them, or as smouldering ruins are of the dreadful conflagration. John Huss enkindled a flame in the bosom of his country, which preyed on its very vitals, and threatened it with utter annihilation, for long years after he was himself no more!

That Huss was a bold and turbulent spirit; that his doctrines naturally tended to insubordination, revolt, and sedition; and that he not only took no precautions to check this sinister tendency, but encouraged it rather, and fanned the flame of popular excitement, we think no candid man will deny. That the effects indicated above did follow his preaching and doctrine, even M. Bonnechose, his most ardent and unscrupulous champion, fully admits. We will allege a few facts and passages from his work to illustrate this branch of the subject.

---

[1] See the propositions extracted from the works of Huss and condemed by the Council of Constance; — not as M. Bonnechose gives them on the authority of Fox (!) — but as they are recorded in the acts of the council itself: especially Propositions i, ii, v, xxi, and xxx. See also Bonnechose, p. 91, where he tells a *part* of the truth in regard to the doctrines of Huss.

[2] See the propositions, in *loco sup. cit.* M. Bonnechose admits that Huss advocated most of those doctrines; but his account is often very vague and inaccurate. Instead of giving us, in one place, a well-digested summary of the doctrines of Huss, he scatters the account of them throughout the book; and he evidently seeks to disguise or conceal their very worst features.

Sbinko, the archbishop of Prague, the declared opponent of Huss and of his doctrines, had perished by poison; and a rumor was already afloat in the community, that he had come to his death through the malice of the Hussites. Our author assures us that this report was unfounded in fact; but he speaks of the excitement which raged at Prague, about this time, in the following language:—

> "But, at Prague, the question no longer was to clear up a fact, which could be to one party a deep disgrace, and to the other a motive of vengeance: *the flames of civil war were gathering at the bottom of men's hearts*, and the rage of parties no longer required a real cause for bursting forth, but only a pretext. It was impossible not to acknowledge the moral authority,— the very serious ascendency,— which John Huss had acquired over men's minds; for no longer were the caprices of fashion, or an inconsiderate infatuation, sufficient to gain over partisans or disciples for his doctrines," &c.[1]

This tremendous excitement between the two hostile parties, composed of the friends and opponents of John Huss at Prague, soon broke out into open sedition, filled the streets with mobs and desolation, and drenched them with blood! Huss had been compelled to fly, but he now returned, and placed himself, with renewed vigor and determination, at the head of his partisans. The magistrates of the city, foreseeing the coming troubles, besought him to desist; but they besought in vain.

> "The magistrates of Prague," says our author, "blamed John Huss, and joined with the heads of the university, the court, and the clergy against him. So many elements of discord," he continues, "portended fresh troubles of a more serious character than those which had already caused the voluntary exile of Huss, but no apprehension shook his resolution."[2]

With his characteristic obstinacy he persisted, and he could not be turned from his course, either by expostulation or by apprehension of the dreadful consequences about to ensue. He put up placards on the doors of the churches and monasteries of Prague, challenging all doctors, priests, monks, and scholars to a public discussion. We will transcribe M. Bonnechose's account of what passed at this discussion:

> "On the appointed day, the concourse was prodigious; and the rector, in alarm, endeavored, though in vain, to dissolve the assembly. A doctor of canon law stood up and delivered a defense of the Pope and the bulls: then, falling on John Huss, he said,— 'you are a priest; you are subordinate to the Pope, who is your spiritual father. It is only filthy birds which defile their own nests; and Ham was accursed for having uncovered his father's shame.' At these words the people murmured and were in great commotion. Already were stones beginning to fly, when John Huss interfered and calmed the storm. After him the impetuous Jerome of

---

[1] P. 36. The real authors of the death of Archbishop Sbinko are unknown. It was natural, however, that suspicion should have rested on the disciples of Huss, of whom he was an open and declared adversary.

[2] P 41.

Prague addressed the multitude, and terminated a vehement harangue with these words:—'Let those who are our friends unite with us; Huss and I are going to the palace, and we will let the vanity of those indulgences be seen.'"[1]

In short,—not to multiply quotations which would take up too much of our space,—John Huss and Jerome of Prague placed themselves at the head of a tumultuous mob, filled the city with confusion, openly defied the authorities; and, as if to make this mob more like that which lately disgraced one of our eastern cities, *desecrated the Sunday* by marching, with arms in their hands, on that day, to the town-house to demand the pardon of three rioters, who, having been arrested by the authorities, were there confined. On the appearance of John Huss with his formidable mob at the prison gates,

> "The magistrates deliberated in trouble and consternation, and the council replied, in the name of all: 'Dear master, we are astonished at your lighting up a fire, in which you run the risk of being burned yourself. It is very hard for us to pardon persons who do not even spare the sanctuary, who fill the city with tumult, and who, if not prevented, would stain our streets with slaughter. Nevertheless, keep the people within bounds, and withdraw: your wishes shall be attended to.'"[2]

But when the rioters had withdrawn at the bidding of Huss, the magistrates thought proper to break a promise extorted from them by threats and fear; and the prisoners were executed. When the mob became acquainted with this fact,

> "A furious tumult arose. The doors of the prison were burst open, the bodies taken off, and transported in linen shrouds under the vault of the chapel of Bethlehem. They were there interred with great honors, the scholars singing in chorus over their tomb,—'They are saints who have given up their bodies for the gospel of God.'"[3]

Huss was the ringleader in all these tumultuous and lawless scenes: and he even pronounced the eulogy of these ruffian rioters and convicted felons, whom he styled "saints and martyrs."[4] On that memorable occasion, in the midst of the most tremendous popular excitement, he, a minister of the God of peace, fanned the flame, by pronouncing a most furious tirade of abuse and invective against the Popes, the clergy, and the Church.[5] The result was awful; mob violence ruled supreme and uncontrolled in the hitherto peaceful city of Prague; and our author himself assures us, that

> "All men's minds seemed in a blaze: the city was daily the theatre of sanguinary scenes; there was no longer security at Prague for personal safety;—even the king himself thought it best to take his departure, and hurried from place to place."[6]

---

[1] P. 41. [2] Id. p. 42. [3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid. When charged with this at the council of Constance, Huss did not deny it.—Id. p. 96.

[5] Ibid. p. 42.

[6] P. 43. It requires no stretch of fancy to observe an almost exact parallelism between the riots at Prague, and those which recently occurred at Philadelphia. Human nature and human passions are ever the same.

Such, then, were the immediate effects of Huss's preaching and doctrines in Prague. At no distant day, as we shall shortly see, these disasters were to be extended, aggravated a hundred-fold, to all Bohemia. But we are tired of these atrocities, and must hasten on in our investigation.

II. What means did Huss adopt to spread his doctrines?

This question will not detain us long. It is easily answered. M. Bonnechose, in fact, answers it for us. Huss formed and increased his party, by strongly appealing to the passions of the ignorant, by delivering violent and inflammatory invectives against the Popes, the bishops, and the clergy; by exposing, and by offering to redress, the grievances of the poor; and by a certain boldness of tone, fixedness of purpose, and rough eloquence, which just suited the mobs whom he addressed, and which made him the idol, because they constituted him the leader and champion, of the multitude. His party once formed, he kept it together, and swelled its numbers, by his indomitable energy and untiring industry, and by his exciting and maddening harangues. By affecting zeal for the correction of abuses, and putting on a sanctimonious air, he succeeded in winning to his standard many of the pious and well disposed, whose simplicity did not penetrate beyond the exterior veil which covered his real purpose; whilst, by appeals to the avarice of kings and princes, he succeeded in inducing many of these also, either to become his partisans, or, at least, to remain neutral. We will present a few extracts from our author, to establish such of these assertions as are not manifest of themselves, or as have not been already proved:

> "Huss had, besides, against his enemies, the powerful support of the nobility, several members of whom were sincerely touched by the elevation and purity of his doctrines, whilst a great number adopted them, either through a spirit of opposition to the court, or through jealousy towards the high clergy, or *through the hope of sharing in their spoils.*"[1]

But Huss soon took effectual means to silence the opposition of the court itself. He knew the weak point in the character of the imbecile Wenceslaus; and he stopped not at anything to win him over to his party. Let us again hear M. Bonnechose:

> "Some of Huss's opinions, particularly that which he borrowed from Wickliffe, respecting titles and church property, were exceedingly to the taste of Wenceslaus. '*Secular lords,*' he used to say, '*have the power of taking away, whenever they please, their temporal possessions from such ecclesiastics as live in habitual sin.*' (*They* were to judge) . . . . . . Wenceslaus adopted those doctrines,—*which were those of the greater portion of the reformers, and which rendered many princes favorable to them.* He, therefore, set himself up as the arbiter of the employment of church property; but, as he cared nothing whatever for the poor, it was into his strong-box that the ill-employed riches of the clergy found their way; and when he openly came forward and supported the new opinions, his severity and his exactions swelled John Huss's party. Several wealthy ecclesiastics declared themselves Hussites; for, *with a view to save their*

---

[1] P. 40.

property, they adopted the doctrines which enjoined a good employment of it."[1]

These, are, indeed, precious avowals, coming, as they do, from a warm eulogist of Huss, and a sworn enemy of Catholicity. They could have been extorted from him only by the sternest evidence of truth. Now, can any one, for a moment, persuade himself that a man who resorted to *such* means, could have been either a saint or a martyr? Saints and martyrs are made of different stuff altogether. It is not the mere circumstance of dying for a cause which makes a martyr, but it is the justice, and the holiness, and the truth of the cause itself.[2] Could that man be reckoned a martyr, who was the leader of armed and infuriate mobs, who made maddening appeals to the most grovelling passions, who fanned into a wild conflagration the flames which himself had lighted up in the bosom of his country, and who reveled amidst the ruins which himself had caused? We think not.

III. Was John Huss always equally bold, and consistent in maintaining his doctrines?

Obstinacy was, indeed, his characteristic trait; but yet, obstinate as he was, he was most certainly a very different character at Prague and at Constance. At Prague, he was bold, daring, reckless; at Constance, he was cautious, reserved, and comparatively timid. At Prague, he boldly announced his doctrines and defended them with an overpowering popular eloquence; at Constance, he modified, concealed, or openly denied them. At Prague, he was the fearless religious demagogue; at Constance, he was the wily and tortuous heresiarch. We defy any one to read M. Bonnechose's history attentively, without being forcibly struck with this remarkable falling off,— this singular inconsistency in one who is yet held up to our admiration as a saint, a martyr, and a stainless reformer of God's holy Church.

Our narrow limits, and the important matters we have yet to examine, will not permit us many details on this subject. Besides, the thing is too plain to need much proof; and we refer with great confidence to the statements of our partial historian himself. Whoever will read and compare even *his* imperfect account of Huss's sermons and works[3] in Bohemia, with that of his defence of himself and of his doctrines at Constance, must be persuaded that, while Huss was the bold and declared enemy of the Church in the former place, he wished to pass for one of her faithful and obedient children in the latter. This inconsistency and this paltry manœuvring are acknowledged and remarked on by M. Bonnechose, who is sadly puzzled how to account for the anomaly. Hear what he says on the subject:

---

[1] P. 42-3.

[2] Martyrem facit non pœna, sed causa,— is an adage, as true as it is old.

[3] Especially his work "on the Church," and his pamphlet: "The Six Errors" "The first" of these errors "was that of the priests who boasted of making the body of Jesus Christ in the mass, and of being the creator of their creator."— Bonnechose, p. 45. Yet at Constance, he openly asserted the real presence, and took God to witness that he had never taught any thing against it! See ib. p. 90, seqq. This is but one, out of many, of the inconsistencies and contradictions of Huss. Cf. also pp. 43, 45, with pp. 90, 104, 105, &c. of our author.

> "He (Huss) protested his attachment and respect for the Catholic Church: he declared his unwillingness to separate from it, and yet unknown to himself (!), he was giving a sensible shock to its foundations, by maintaining that believers had the right to examine its decrees before they submitted to them. Who does not perceive that, on the one hand, obedience to a Church which declares itself to be immutable and infallible, and, on the other, examination and appeal to an internal criterion — the conscience — are two things contrary to each other and incompatible? *It would be a difficult thing to affirm that John Huss believed that he could reconcile them*, or that he had supposed that he had succeeded in the task. We can not, indeed, comprehend how he could have deceived himself on this point. Yet it is most certain that he attempted to effect an agreement between these two hostile principles, and that he thus carried in his bosom the germs of a violent struggle, at once irreconcilable and interminable. That was the formidable and insolvable problem, which agitated his life and hastened his end,"[1] &c.

We must furnish another curious extract from our author on the same subject. It occurs in the closing paragraph of the chapter in which he treats of the death of Huss; and it is valuable, as presenting his views of the general character of the reformer:

> "As to the right of the matter, before he (Huss) admitted that any proposition was heretical or false, he required to have its falsehood demonstrated by Scripture. This was to recognize in the divine word, interpreted by private judgement, an authority superior to the decisions of the Church — it was to attack the clergy in their spiritual authority. . . Strange destiny of Huss! Most curious problem! In his way of thinking, all separation from the old trunk of the Church is a heresy worthy of hell; and yet the separated churches reckon him, with pride, amongst their martyrs! . . . . . John Huss considered himself a Catholic, and yet he appealed from the Church to his conscience and to God! *He was a Protestant without knowing it!*"[2]

We confess that we can not believe that Huss was so simple. He was not such a *goose*[3] as this theory would make him appear. The truth is, he had taken a wrong step, and he *felt* it; he occupied a false position, and he did not wish to leave it. He had a strong and clamorous party to sustain him: he was their leader and head; they hung upon his lips, and they could be led like children by his words. He *felt* that he could not retract without displeasing his party, on whose praises he had been so long accustomed to feast: he had not the humility nor the moral courage to go back: he would rather die first; — for, in this case, he would be hailed as a martyr, and he might live with posterity. He had evidently more regard for his party than for the truth. Had he been a solitary man, without a party, he never would have mustered courage to die at Constance. Such at least is our candid opinion; and we think we do him no injustice.

---

[1] P. 34.

[2] P. 105.

[3] *Huss* is Bohemian for *goose;* and Huss himself often punned on his name. See Bonnechose, p. 86, note. So then if we err, either in taste or in politeness, we do it not without an illustrious precedent. It is remarkable, also, that the family name of Jerome of Prague, *Faulfish*, means a *foul fish*. At least the names of both of the Bohemian reformers were ominous. That of Jerome, however, was much more appropriate than that of Huss.

IV. A still more important question, is — had Huss a fair trial at Constance?

We sincerely believe that he had; and to prove it, we need no other vouchers than the *facts* of the case,— apart from the false coloring and unfair construction,— as given by M. Bonnechose himself. The following facts are certain and undoubted.

1st. John Huss went to the council of Constance, of his own accord, in *voluntary* obedience to the summons of the emperor Sigismund, and with the avowed purpose of answering the charges of his enemies, and proving that he had said and written nothing against the Catholic faith. He often boasted, even before the council, that he had come to Constance of his own free will; and that had he chosen to remain in Bohemia, his powerful partisans there could have concealed and protected him, even against the king of Bohemia, and his more powerful brother, the emperor Sigismund himself.[1] Before his departue from Prague,

> "In a paper affixed to the gates of the palace, he announced that he was about to depart, in order to justify himself before the council. 'So that,' said he, 'if any one suspects me of heresy, let him proceed thither and prove, in presence of the Pope and the doctors, if I ever entertained or taught any false or mistaken doctrine. If any man can convict me of having inculcated any doctrine contrary to the Christian faith, *I will consent to undergo all the penalty to which heretics are liable.*'"[2] &c.

2d. After he had arrived at Constance, he had three different hearings from the council; and the investigation into his doctrines and writings was full, lengthy, and detailed. Though the weighty affair of the schism, and much other most perplexing business, pressed heavily on the council, yet the assembled fathers consented to go into a minute and patient examination of his doctrines, article by article, and to hear his answer to each of the charges preferred against him. Nothing could be fairer, or more in conformity with law and usage, than the whole order of the proceedings. His books were first produced, and he was asked whether they contained his genuine writings. Then his accusers, among whom the principal were his countrymen, Stephen Paletz and Michael Causis, stood forth in open court, and distinctly uttered their charges against him; and many witnesses were summoned to corroborate their testimony. John Huss had the privilege of answering all the accusations separately; and, though there seems to have been, once or twice, some murmuring in the assembly, owing to the exciting nature of the inquiry, yet the whole trial was generally conducted with calmness and with temper.[3]

3d. When John Huss denied the truth of many of the articles alleged against him, and maintained that he had never taught the doctrines with which he stood charged, the accusations were made good by a regular course of testimony,— by the oath of men who had heard him preach in Prague and Bohemia, some of whom had been his intimate friends,[4] and all of whom were men of integrity and above suspicion. After this formidable array of evidence, the Cardinal of Florence, Gabarella, might well address Huss as follows:

---

[1] See M. Bonnechose, p. 92.

[2] Ibid, p. 49. See also p. 57.

[3] All this is admitted by M. Bonnechose, p. 89 seqq. For the excitement in the council, which he certainly greatly exaggerates, we have little more evidence than his bare word.

[4] As, for instance, Paletz.

> "Master John Huss, you must know that it is written, that what is in the mouth of two or three witnesses must be considered a veritable testimony. Now here are *twenty* persons worthy of confidence, who declare that you have preached this doctrine which is imputed to you. The greater number of them adduce, in support of their assertions, unanswerable proofs: — is it possible that you defend yourself against them all?"[1]

4th. It was in vain that John Huss appealed to his God and to his conscience against all this testimony. Such an appeal would have been received against *such* evidence in no court of justice. It was a question of *fact*, and not of mere conscience; and the cardinal could well answer: "we cannot decide after your conscience, but on clear and well established evidence."[2] Besides, his chief accusers, Paletz and Causis, also appealed to their God and their conscience, in proof of their sincerity, and of the truth of their charges:

> "Paletz then rose up and cried out: 'I call God to witness, in presence of the emperor and the sacred council, that I have said nothing here through hatred to John Huss, nor through any malevolent feeling, and that I have not set myself up as the adversary of so many errors, but through zeal for the Catholic church.' Michael Causis repeated the same oath."[3]

In view of all these unquestionable facts, it must be admitted that John Huss had a fair trial, and that, if he was convicted, it was solely by the force of evidence. He had appeared voluntarily before the council; he was a priest of the Catholic Church, and, therefore, was fairly amenable to her authority; he maintained that he was still a true Catholic, and that he had said no word, written no sentence, done no deed, against the Catholic faith; he challenged an investigation, and declared that he was willing to abide its result; it was a question of *fact* to be decided by evidence; evidence, strong and overwhelming, was produced; he answered it by an appeal to his conscience; the appeal was not legitimate and could not be admitted; he was convicted of erroneous doctrines under all these circumstances: — and where is the man, we would ask, not wholly blinded by prejudice, who will still say that he was not lawfully convicted, or that he had not a fair trial?

V. But we must pass on to the next inquiry: — did the council of Constance treat John Huss with wanton cruelty?

We answer, without hesitation, in the negative; and we think we can sustain our answer by facts, much stronger than the mere declamation of those who, for the last four centuries, have been in the habit of constantly reiterating this charge. Nor will it require much time or space to establish our proposition.

As we have already sufficiently proved, neither the Church, nor especially the council of Constance, made the law by which heretics were liable to be punished with death. It had been enacted two centuries before by the German emperors; and they alone,—and not the council of Constance,—were fairly responsible for it and for its results. It was the emperor Sigismund and the elector Palatine, and not the fathers of the council of Constance, who passed sentence of death on Huss.[1] It was the magistrates of Constance, acting under the direction of the two high functionaries just named, who presided at his execution. After having convicted him of heresy, and excommunicated and degraded him from his priestly office, the council *expressly* declared that it had no power to proceed any farther against him.[2] According to a fixed and standing law of the Catholic Church,—a law embodied as an adage[3] in the canon law itself, and strict and universal in its application,—the council could proceed no farther.

---

[1] See M. Bonnechose, p. 91.

[2] Ib. p. 91.

[3] P. 93.

Before the council pronounced judgment on the doctrines of Huss, the emperor Sigismund had already declared to him, in presence of the assembled fathers, that, by a standing law of the empire, heresy was punishable with death; and he had added, that unless Huss would retract his errors, he would, with his own hands, be ready to light up the fire which would consume him.[4] Huss himself, as we have seen, was well aware of this law; he openly admitted its justice before the council itself; and in the placards he had put up in Prague and on his journey to Constance, he had declared his readiness to submit to its hard penalty, in case he should be convicted of heresy.[5]

Had the council thirsted for the blood of Huss, would it not have been eager to exact the punishment ordained by the imperial laws? Would it not have loudly clamored for his execution? The acts of the council, however, state nothing of the kind; but they do state, and M. Bonnechose himself admits the fact, that the fathers did every thing in their power to rescue Huss from death, by laboring to persuade him to make at least a modified retraction of his errors. No effort was spared to bring about this result; the only means, then known to the laws, by which he could be saved. Formulary after formulary of retraction was submitted to him; embassy after embassy was sent: cardinals, bishops, his own chief accuser Paletz, the emperor himself, with tears in their eyes, urged and entreated Huss to retract. But arguments, entreaties, tears, were all lost on the obstinate and immovable Bohemian. Huss was inflexible. He could have escaped death; but he rushed into its jaws.[6]

Nor let us be told that Huss could not retract, without sacrificing his conscience. He may have been conscientious: but, from what we have seen of his character, there seems to have been more of false pride and of sheer obstinacy, than of conscience in his whole conduct. He had already, in open council, disavowed nearly all the errors imputed to him; he had condemned the most obnoxious principles of Wickliffe; he had sought to prove himself a thorough and obedient Catholic. He had declared, over and over again, that he had never taught the doctrines ascribed to him, as he said, by his enemies, through sheer malice and calumny; and yet he would not retract them! And he based his refusal on the ground, that if he did retract them, his opponents would say that he had taught them! The emperor Sigismund answered this quibble, as follows:

---

[1] Fiddes and Dr. Brown Willis, English Protestants, both candidly admit that if there was any blame in the matter, it attached, in all fairness, to the emperor alone. See Life of Card'l. Wolsey, p 137. L'Enfant also admits it, though a Calvinist, Hist. Conc. Const. L. iii, § 48.

[2] See Acts of the Council, Sess. xv.

[3] *Ecclesia abhorret a sanguine.* No clergyman was allowed to shed blood, even as a surgeon, much less to pronounce directly or indirectly, sentence of death on any one.

[4] L'Enfant, *loco citato*, § 8.

[5] In addition to the authorities already quoted, (*supra*) see L'Enfant Liv. 1, § 21, and L. iii, § 7.

[6] See, for proof of all this, Bonnechose, pp. 95, 97, 98, 99.

> "What can you fear in abjuring all these articles? For my part, I have no hesitation in disavowing all kinds of errors; but does it follow that I have entertained them?"[1]

The emperor himself, after all other means had failed, sent a commission of four bishops, with some of the principal friends of Huss, to persuade him to submit. Huss wished to argue with them; not to acquiesce quietly in the decision of the council. "Do you, then," said one of the bishops, "believe yourself wiser than the whole council?"[2] Huss evaded this searching question by an appeal to the Scriptures and to his conscience, and by a professed willingness to be taught "in the divine word by the least person in the council!"[3] Here, then, was the real issue: — private judgment against Church authority. This was the true secret of his obstinacy. And this overweening pride and obstinate self-will were greatly encouraged by John de Chlum and his other partisans at Constance.[4]

Had the principles of Huss been merely speculative and harmless; had they not struck at the very foundations of all social order; had they not already produced their legitimate effects of seditions and bloodshed in Bohemia; we think that, notwithstanding his obstinacy, he might yet have been spared. At least, in that supposition, we would feel much more strongly inclined to sympathize with him. But with all these unquestionable facts in view, we cannot, at least, coincide with those who would fain exalt him to the rank of a saint and a martyr.

VI. But the most weighty charge against the council of Constance remains yet to be examined: — did the council act perfidiously towards John Huss?

That the council decoyed John Huss to Constance under the faith and protection of a safe conduct; that it then decreed his death in spite of that plighted faith; and that, to sustain this perfidious course, it openly sanctioned the principle that "no faith is to be kept with heretics;" these are charges so often made by prejudiced and ignorant writers, and so often and so triumphantly refuted from the history and acts of the council itself, that we are much pleased to find so prejudiced a writer as M. Bonnechose abandon them altogether.[1] This is some evidence that truth and good sense are beginning at length to resume their sway in the world.

---

[1] See M. Bonnechose. p. 95 [2] Ibid, p. 99. [3] Ibid.

[4] Much has been said and written about the imprisonment of Huss, and the cruelties inflicted on him in prison. But was he not permitted to correspond with his friends, and even to write whole treatises in prison? And did not he himself thank his keepers for their humanity and good treatment? (See Bonnechose, p. 104)

This implied admission will release us from the necessity of going into lengthy details on this branch of the subject. But as our author intimates in more places than one, that the emperor Sigismund violated the safe conduct which he had given to John Huss; as he garbles the safe conduct itself, and as he omits many important facts and misstates others, we may be pardoned for furnishing a brief exposition of the whole case.

First, then, it is altogether certain that the council of Constance never gave a safe conduct to John Huss at all, and, therefore, that it could not, by possibility, have violated any faith plighted to him. This fact no one will or can deny.

2. It gave, indeed, a safe conduct to Jerome of Prague; but that instrument merely guaranteed to him protection in coming to Constance, and in defending his doctrine while there; but it expressly stipulated, that this protection was not meant to prevent his conviction, if guilty, or to frustrate the due course of law.[2] Besides, M. Bonnechose admits, that this safe conduct did not reach Jerome before his arrest by the civil officers in the Black Forest, while he was flying from Constance; and that, by a necessary inference, he could not properly claim the privileges which it granted.[3] Thus it is apparent, that there could have been no breach of faith on the part of the council, in regard either to Huss or to Jerome.

3. The safe conduct granted to John Huss by the emperor Sigismund was evidently a mere traveling passport, intended to protect him from indignity, detention, and outrage, on his journey from Bohemia to Constance, but not, by any means, to protect him from the consequences growing out of the due course of law. Huss never solicited nor even expected any such exemption, and the emperor could never have meant to grant anything of the kind. With an imperial document guaranteeing so wide a protection as this, what was the use of Huss' journey to Constance? What was the meaning of his boast, made at Prague and on the journey, that he went to Constance of his own accord, to defend himself against the charge of heresy, or to abide its penalty? There would have been no object whatever in his visit, and the whole affair would have been a solemn mockery and a ridiculous farce. Does a passport given now-a-days secure the bearer from legal prosecution and conviction? Or was a passport ever known, in the whole history of the world, to grant this species of exemption? If not, then why extort this absurd meaning from that granted by Sigismund to John Huss?

The clause — "to return," &c., was evidently a mere form usual in similar instruments, and the whole document, with all its details and legal forms, marks it as a mere passport. Huss had many violent enemies in Germany, which he was compelled to traverse on his way to Constance. The German students, whom he had caused to be expelled from Prague, bore him a mortal grudge; and it was to secure his person from these enemies, and to facilitate his journey, that the safe conduct was given.[1] It could have had no other object.

---

[1] At least if M. Bonnechose says expressly any thing of the kind, it has entirely escaped our notice The only hint on the subject we have observed is found on p. 61, and that is not entirely clear or explicit.

[2] M. Bonnechose admits this, though he ascribes unworthy motives to the council. The modifying clause was *salva justitia*, p. 73.

[3] Ibid.

4. The emperor himself gave precisely this explanation of the meaning attached by him to the safe conduct, in a public address delivered before the council of Constance, in the presence of Huss and his friends, and his explanation was acquiesced in by them; at least they said naught against it at the time.[2]

5. But whatever protection was intended to be granted by the imperial safe conduct, Huss forfeited all claims to it, by officiating openly at Constance, though under papal excommunication,[3] and especially by his attempted flight from the city. Of this last fact, though it was the immediate cause of the imprisonment of Huss,[4] M. Bonnechose says not a word! Yet it is attested by Ulrich Reichental, a citizen of Constance, and an eye-witness![5] Why omit so important a fact?[6]

Thus, then, it is manifest, from the clearest and most incontestable evidence, that neither the council of Constance nor the emperor Sigismund acted with bad faith towards either John Huss or Jerome of Prague. All these facts must be blotted from the pages of history, before any such conclusion can be reached.

Much is said about the patience and heroism with which Huss and Jerome met death. But even were we to admit all that their partisans have written on the subject, it would not prove them to have been either saints or martyrs. Sincere enthusiasts they might have been, martyrs they certainly were not. The ancient martyrs were patient, humble, *obedient to the Church*, and they died to seal with their blood the religion of Jesus Christ. Huss and Jerome died, as the founders and partisans of a truculent sect, the doctrines of which were subversive of all social order, and the acts of which filled all Bohemia with sedition, riots, sacrilege, and bloodshed; as we shall soon see more in detail.

---

[1] See the safe conduct as given entire from the original documents, by Natalis Alexander—Historia Ecclesiastica, vol. ix, p. 407, edit. Venet. 1778, in 10 vols. folio. The mere reading of the document proves it to have been nothing more nor less than a simple passport.

[2] M. Bonnechose admits this, and gives the emperor's address, pp. 92, 93.

[3] See the acts of the council, sess. 10.

[4] The letters of Huss to his friends, and M. Bonnechose's own admission, establish the fact that, for more than twenty-six days, Huss was entirely free and unrestrained at Constance (Ib. p. 56.)

[5] In his history of the council, written in German, and quoted by Cochlœus — Histor. Hussitarum, lib. ii, pp. 78, 74, Reichental gives all the details of the attempted flight of Huss, and of his arrest by Latzembock, a Bohemian nobleman to whose charge he had been entrusted by the emperor.

[6] In the text, M. Bonnechose says not a syllable about this attempted flight of Huss. But in note H, at the end of the volume (p. 189), he admits that not only Reichental but another eye-witness, Gebhard Ducher, certifies the fact. Nay, more, he funishes a lengthy extract from the sixth book of L'Enfant's (Calvinist) history of the council of Constance, in which this unexceptionable historian relates the whole occurrence in full. He also admits that Naucler and the Abbe Tritheme, who wrote about a century after the council, relate the fact as certain; and that John Cochlœus, Maimbourg, Varillas, and "*all* the modern authors" mention it. Yet he will not admit its authenticity, because, forsooth, certain other authors, favorites of his, did not think proper to relate it, and because no mention of it is made in the acts of the council! This preferring of negative to positive evidence would, if carried out, sap the foundations of all history.

The decree of the council, sanctioned in the nineteenth session, merely explained the safe conduct given to John Huss by the emperor in the very sense in which Sigismund had already explained it, viz: that it was not intended to prevent the legal examination and conviction of Huss by the council, but merely to insure him protection against illegal violence and outrage on his journey. To put any other construction upon it is to offer violence to the plainest language. It merely asserts, what every one admits, that a traveling passport is not intended to stop the ordinary course of law, nor to protect the guilty; and that he who has granted it is not responsible for the action of the law against the individual in whose favor it was given. The decree was probably made to quiet the clamors of some Bohemian partisans of Huss, after his arrest and imprisonment by order of the emperor.[1]

So far, in fact, was the council from approving the abominable maxim,—"Faith is not to be kept with heretics,"—or of sanctioning perjury in any form or shape, that, among the questions which it drew up after the election of Martin V., to be put to those suspected of heresy, there was one in which the suspected person was to be asked whether he believed that, under any circumstances, or for any reason whatever, it was allowable for him to falsify the truth, or to perjure himself. The motive for adopting this form of interrogation, was the charge often made against the Hussites, that they would not scruple to commit perjury, in order to conceal or defend their doctrines. If this charge was true,—and there is strong evidence to sustain it,—it appears that, as has often happened both before and since, the Catholic church was *accused* of the very maxims and crimes of which her adversaries were *guilty!*

We will conclude this paper by furnishing a very rapid sketch of what took place in Bohemia, after the death of John Huss and Jerome of Prague. The terrible events which ensued there, and filled all Bohemia with confusion, sacrilege, and bloodshed, for nearly half a century, present the best possible commentary on the life and doctrines of Huss. They were but the bitter fruits of that tree of disobedience, which *he* had planted in once peaceful and happy Bohemia! "By their fruits ye shall know them," said our blessed Lord; and we are going to apply this divine rule.

The mantle of Huss fell on the shoulders of Ziska, his friend, his disciple, his avenger, near whose tomb was engraved this inscription: "O

---

[1] The decree is as follows in the original:—"Præsens Sancta Synodus ex quovis salvo conductu per imperatorem, reges et alios sæculi principes, hæreticis vel de hæresi diffamatis, putantes eosdem sic a suis erroribus revocare, quocumque vinculo se adstrinxerint, concesso, nullum fidei Catholicæ vel jurisdictioni ecclesiasticæ præjudicium generari vel impedimentum præstari posse seu debere declarat, quominus dicto salvo conductu non obstante, liceat judici competenti et ecclesiastico de hujusmodi personarum erroribus inquirere, et alias contra eos debite procedere, eosdemque punire in quantum justitia suadebit, si suos errores revocare pertinaciter recusaverint, etiamsi de salvo conductu confisi ad locum venerint judicii, alias non venturi; nec sic promittentem, cum fecerit quod in ipse est, ex hoc in aliquo remansisse obligatum." Sessio xix. Labbei Concilia, vol. xii. col. 169

Huss! here reposes John Ziska, thy avenger, and the emperor himself has quailed before him!"[1] Perhaps of all the dark deeds recorded in the annals of mankind, those done in Bohemia, at this period, were the darkest; and of all the dark names which are found on the pages of history, that of Ziska is the darkest!

During his lifetime, and for half a century after his death, his very name made all Europe shudder with horror. Whithersoever he bent his course, he rioted amidst carnage and ruins. He combined the cruelty of Attila with the fanaticism of Cromwell; and his fanatical followers had the fierce ruthlessness of the Huns, blended with, but not softened by, the stern religious enthusiasm of the Roundheads. During the few years that this truculent monster headed the armies of the Hussites,— from the death of Huss in 1415 to his own death on the 11th of October, 1424,— Bohemia was changed from a blooming garden into a frightful and frowning wilderness. Let us hear even our very partial historian, M. Bonnechose, on this subject:—

> "Bohemia, from one extremity to the other, soon became one vast field of carnage; everywhere conflagrations displayed to view dreadful massacres; woe to the towns, castles, and, above all, the monasteries that closed their gates,— all passed by the edge of the sword. The sight of a monk or a priest filled Ziska with a gloomy rage. . . . . He smote, burned, and exterminated, coldly glutting his vengeance in the shock of combatants, the gleam of flames, the shrieks of victims, 'punishing,' as Balbinus expresses it, 'one sacrilege by a thousand!' Bohemia, Germany, and Europe, were soon filled with the name of this terrible man. Wenceslaus awoke from his shameful slumber at the noise of his falling palaces, of his churches in ashes, of his senate massacred; he started up in a frightful fit of passion, which was injurious to himself alone, for his fury suffocated him."[2]

The followers of "this terrible man" were called Taborites; "their enemies were the Philistines, the Moabites, the Ammonites: Sigismund was the red horse of the Apocalypse: Bohemia was the land of promise. The mountains adjoining Prague received the biblical name of Horeb: their fierce inhabitants descended from them at the call of Ziska, and hurried to his standard,"[3] and their leader called himself "Ziska of the cup."

Already blind of one eye, he was deprived of the other by the wound of an arrow at the siege of Raby:

> "But in becoming blind, he became still more terrible,— his wound was a fresh stimulus to his rage as to his genius, and revealed in him faculties really almost incredible. His memory of localities was prodigious: it was quite sufficient for him to have once passed through a country, to remain forever perfect master of all its slightest incidents. Bohemia, with her waters, woods, valleys, and plains, was now as present to his thoughts as the reality had ever been to his sight. A spirit of fire in a body of iron, his activity knew no fatigue, and became exasperated at rest. 'All seasons and weather are alike to this blind man,' his soldiers

---

[1] Bonnechose, p. 165.

[2] Ib. p. 158.

[3] Ib. p. 160.

used to mutter; 'he goes by night as by day.' Wherever there was a monastery to burn, or a town to take, or an army to combat, he hurried to the spot, and was soon accomplishing the deed of blood, with a superhuman force, as if urged to the work by an exterminating God."[1]

Such was Ziska "of the cup," the successor of John Huss, and the very impersonation of Hussism. He never knew defeat; he conquered in eleven pitched battles. He often raged against his own followers, with as much cruelty as against his enemies. He bequeathed his fiendish spirit to the two Procopiuses, who succeeded him as leaders of the Hussites; and to animate their courage, and to keep up the fierce and sanguinary spirit of his followers, he bequeathed to them a martial instrument of music, such as never was heard of either before or since!

"He expired (of the plague) on October 11, 1424, ordering his soldiers *to abandon his body to birds of prey, and to have his skin made into a drum, the mere noise of which would cast terror into his enemies.*"[2]

Such, then, were the fruits of the doctrines and of the obstinacy of John Huss! For it was certainly more owing to the truculent character and tendency of those doctrines, than to any mere revenge for his death, that Bohemia was filled with all those atrocities. Such was the dark and bloody monument which Bohemia erected to his memory! So much mischief can one bad man do in the world!

---

[1] Bonnechose, p. 161.

[2] Ib. p. 164.

XI. THE SPANISH INQUISITION.—PRESCOTT'S VIEW.*

Interest of Spanish history—Evils arising from the French revolution—Can Spain become Protestant? —Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella—His character as an historian—His prejudices—His authorities on the Spanish Inquisition—Who was Limborch?—His reliability—Character of Llorente—Writers on the other side—Prescott's view—His statements examined—Three propositions established—Was the Spanish Inquisition a religious or a political institution?—Its origin traced—A parallel case—Remarkable testimony of Ranke—The alleged cruelties of the inquisition—Are they exaggerated? —Authority of Voltaire—Of Bourgoing—And of Limborch—The civil and ecclesiastical courts—"Justice and Mercy"—Mode of procedure—Motive for secrecy—Torture—Jurisprudence of the time—In what court was the final decision given?—Count Polnitz--English and Genevan Inquisition —Was counsel allowed the accused?—Is the Catholic Church responsible for the Spanish Inquisition?—Agency of the Roman Pontiffs—Their efforts to restrain cruelty—The Portuguese Inquisition

The history of few countries is invested with greater interest than that of Spain. Her annals are varied in incident, rich in moral, and full of instruction for the philosopher and Christian. No country of Europe has preserved the spirit of mediæval chivalry so pure, or for so long a time. This spirit is impressed on all her institutions, and is yet visible in the high character and lofty bearing of her people. The type of her national character is still, to a great extent, that of the ancient knights of St. Iago, of Calatrava, and of Alcantara; the only difference is, that it has been softened down to suit the more pacific tendencies of the present age. Her whole history is replete with strange vicissitudes and startling occurrences.

No country, perhaps, has exercised a more powerful influence on civilization in Europe, or done more to extend its boundaries into regions remote and before unknown. But for the liberal enterprise and enlightened policy of her sovereigns, the ardor of Columbus might have cooled, and America remained undiscovered for centuries. With the names of Alfonso the Wise, of Sancho the Great, and of Ferdinand and Isabella, among her princes and legislators; with those of Don Rodrigo Diaz del Bivar, the renowned *Campion* or Cid, and of Gonsalvo de Cordova, the "great captain," among her generals; and with those of Calderon, Lope de Vega, Cervantes, Herrera, and Garcilaso de la Vega among her literati, not to mention many others, she has little to fear from comparison with any other nation. The calendar is crowded with the names of her saints; St. Dominic, St. Vincent Ferrer, St. Teresa, St. Peter of Alcantara, St. Ignatius, St. Francis Xavier, and hosts of others are her patrons in heaven.

The interest in Spanish history and institutions is greatly increased by the present critical condition of that country. The storm which lately swept over Spain, threatened to destroy almost every monument of her former greatness, and to carry away every vestige of the middle ages. It was an evil day for Spain when, half a century ago, her soil became the theatre of a sanguinary struggle between the hosts of France and England. All her present evils date back to that ill-fated period. The Peninsular war sowed upon her soil the seeds of French infidelity and of English Protestantism, and these seeds are now producing their bitter fruits. And it is remarkable that the startling proceedings which took place in Spain about ten years ago were accordingly distinguished by the fierce fanaticism of the French revolution, tempered with the cold, calculating policy of the reformation in England under Henry VIII. We trace the policy of England in the invasion of Church property, and in the destruction of the monasteries; and that of France in the massacre of the monks at Barcelona and elsewhere.

---

*History of the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, the Catholic. By William H. Prescott. 3 vols. 8 vo. pp. 411, 509, and 496. Boston. Fifth edition 1839.

Whatever may be the final results of the fierce revolutionary struggle through which the peninsula has lately passed, one thing at least appears to be certain. The climate of Spain is too *warm* for Protestantism; on *her* soil the Protestant sects would be exotics which could have but a sickly growth at best, and which would soon wither and die. The only climate at all congenial with Protestantism is the cold, calculating north; it is too dreary, too devoid of feeling and soul, to suit the ardent temperament of the south. The Spaniards are too thoroughly Catholic, ever to be tainted, at least to any great extent, by the errors of the last three centuries. The appeal of the late sovereign Pontiff in behalf of suffering Spain, met with such a response, in the bosoms of millions all over the world, as bespoke Catholic unity, and told of the depths of that sympathy, which flows from Catholic charity. Only the Catholic Church can present the spectacle of the whole world thus forgetting every sectional and political difference, and, at the voice of one old man, kneeling before one common altar, and in divine unison of faith and feeling, praying for one common object. That prayer was heard, and Spain has been preserved to the Church!

Mr. Prescott has selected for the subject of his work the most interesting and brilliant period of Spanish history. The age of Ferdinand and Isabella is to Spain, what that of Louis XIV. was subsequently to France; and what, immediately after, the pontificate of Leo X. was to Italy and to the world. It was the era in which she laid broad and deep the foundations of that solid glory, which made her for more than two centuries the first country in Europe. It was the age which witnessed the glories of Ponce De Leon, and of Gonsalvo de Cordova, in the field; of Cardinals Mendoza and Ximenes, in the cabinet; and of Christopher Columbus on the broader field of the world, discovering a new continent. Mr. Prescott could scarcely have chosen a loftier theme. And he has brought to the execution of his task a great amount of learning, as well as much industry and care in the arrangement of his copious materials. His work manifests a degree of research into Spanish history highly creditable to the author; the more so, as in its preparation he had to encounter for a time the formidable obstacle of almost total blindness.[1] Such works may be often met with in Italy or Germany, and occasionally in France or England, but they are extremely rare in our light and frivolous age, and yet more so in our republic, where the *utilitarian* system of estimating every thing in dollars and cents, has perhaps taken deeper root than any where else in the world. The United States may well be proud of two such historians as Prescott and Bancroft.

---

[1] See his Preface.

It is not our purpose to furnish a lengthy review of Mr. Prescott's history. It is before the American community and may speak for itself. In our opinion the style is more natural, and better adapted to historical narrative than the more florid manner of Bancroft, who seems to have caught no little of the transcendental and *Bulwerian* infection of the age. What is, however, most pleasing in the history of Ferdinand and Isabella, is the array of learned references, by which each statement is sustained. Not only is every original document and work cited, but the very edition and page are carefully marked, so as to facilitate, in a high degree, the researches of the scholar who might feel disposed to verify the quotations. The statements of the author may be relied on, wherever he confines himself to facts, unless when he views them through the improper medium of undue prejudice, or is misled, as to the facts themselves, by prejudiced authority. Then he either greatly miscolors, or wholly perverts the facts. We will endeavor to show that he has committed both these faults in the seventh Chapter of his first volume, pp. 230–269, where he gives a detailed history of the "Modern Inquisition" in Spain; and our remarks on his history will be confined to this Chapter.

That he was greatly under the influence of anticatholic prejudice, we infer from the whole tenor of the Chapter, which is in fact as virulent a libel upon Catholicity as we have ever chanced to read. To prove that the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition were in accordance with the principles of the Catholic Church, he repeats[1] the stale calumny that a Catholic principle is embodied in the odious proposition, "the end justifies the means." He turns out of his way to attack the Catholic doctrine of confession, which he designates[2] an "artful institution" of the priests, to gain influence with the people; and to show how Isabella's repugnance to the establishment of the Inquisition was overcome, he relates a very simple, if not absurd anecdote of what passed between her and her confessor, Talavera.[3] In opposition to all history, he still asserts that St. Dominic was the founder of the ancient Inquisition, or at least maintains that if he was not, in point of fact, he *ought* to have been.[4] He tells, in a satirical tone, of the divine eloquence and wonderful miracles by which St. Vincent Ferrer, in the fourteenth century, converted to Christianity thirty-five thousand Spanish Jews.[5] The sufferings of this unfortunate people enlist his deepest sympathy; the Moors of Grenada have also his warmest feelings; these two people seem to have exhausted his stock of humanity, and he has no sympathy to throw away upon the Catholic Christians of Spain! Nor is he alone in this respect. It is the fault of most Protestant historians. Their sympathies run strongly in favor of Jew, Turk, or dissenter of every shade of opinion, while for the Catholic they reserve the vials of their wrath! Is it, that there is a kindred spirit among errorists of every hue, a certain relationship which makes them have a tender feeling for one another? It would seem so. The chief severity of this remark consists in its truth; and we have only to open Protestant historians *passim*, to become persuaded of it. Mr. Prescott furnishes abundant evidence of this spirit throughout his work.

---

[1] Vol. i, p. 245.

[2] Ibid. p. 246.

[3] Ibid.

[4] This is the purport of his reasoning (p. 282, note). See La Cordaire's late work "Apology for the order of St. Dominic," in which this charge is ably refuted by undeniable evidence.

[5] Vol. i, p. 240.

It was scarcely to be expected that, reared as he evidently has been in all the prejudices of Protestantism, Mr. Prescott should have become wholly divested of the early impressions of the nursery, so as to approach the subject of the horrible Spanish Inquisition, with a calm mind and a steady nerve. It was difficult to dispel the bloody phantoms of slaughtered victims, which had haunted his early days, and to get rid of the opinions in regard to that tribunal which had been fastened on his mind by the teachings of the press and of the pulpit. But at least, as a faithful historian, he should have exhibited its redeeming as well as its odious features; and to have qualified himself for this task, he should have read both sides, and not have suffered himself to be misled by violently prejudiced writers. That many of those whom he has followed are of this character, we will endeavor to show; and then we will glance rapidly at the principal works written in defense of the Inquisition, which Mr. Prescott seems either not to have seen at all, or not to have read.

The historians of the Spanish Inquisition most in favor with Protestants, are Limborch and Llorente. Mr. Prescott cites them both, and bases most of his statements upon the authority of the latter, who is so great a favorite with him as to merit a special biographical notice at the close of his chapter on the Inquisition. To ascertain how far they are to be relied on, as historians of the Inquisition, we must see who they were, under what circumstances they wrote their respective histories, and what motives prompted them to the task.

Philip Limborch was a native of Holland, and he belonged to the sect of the Remonstrants or mitigated Calvinists. He was a disciple of the famous scholar, Vossius, who with Grotius had suffered so much from the intolerant synod of Dort, which in 1619 had consummated the division of the Dutch Calvinists. He attained to considerable eminence in his sect, in which he became a minister, and subsequently a professor of theology at Amsterdam. He was not, however, very rigid in adhering even to the slight standard of orthodoxy required by his own party; for he became a Unitarian, and was a great friend of the noted Unitarian, John Le Clerc, who lauds his writings to the skies. Had John Calvin been able to arise from his tomb, his recreant disciple might have stood a good chance to be bound to the stake with Servetus, whose tenets he advocated; and had the Gomarist, or rigid Calvinist party in Holland been unchecked in enforcing the exclusive and persecuting canons of Dort, Limborch might have suffered martyrdom, or at least have been a confessor with Grotius and Vossius.[1] However, he escaped unscathed, but with a deep and abiding sense of the wrongs his party had endured from the Gomarists. He determined to shoot an arrow at them through the Spaniards, whose very name had been execrated in Holland, since the days of Philip II. of Spain, and of the duke of Alba. The memory of the fierce and bloody struggle with the Spaniards, in which so many harrowing scenes had occurred on both sides, was still fresh in the minds of the Dutch. To be sure they had, to say the least, been guilty of as much cruelty, as the duke of Alba and his soldiery; but this was forgotten, and the cruelty of the Spaniard was alone remembered, and that Inquisition which he had in vain endeavored to establish in the two countries was viewed with inconceivable horror. The very name caused a cold shudder to seize on every Hollander. Limborch shared deeply in these feelings, and he knew how extensive and how all absorbing they were among his countrymen. He knew that he could not better cater to their taste than by writing a detailed history of this odious tribunal: and he accordingly set about the work and published it in one volume folio, at Amsterdam, in 1692. His anticipations were realized; the work was received with acclamations. The minds of his countrymen were too much excited to enable them to perceive the glaring inaccuracies and gross misstatements of the book; and had he painted the horrors of the Inquisition with tenfold force, their deadly hatred of the tribunal would have caused them to devour the work without one misgiving!

Such was Limborch. He evidently wrote his history under such excitement as would naturally lead us to expect little of the impartiality of the historian, and much of the exaggeration of a man writing against a tribunal odious in a religious and political point of view, and pandering also to a taste greatly vitiated and highly excited. Accordingly we find in his work few of the intrinsic qualities of a veridical history. He professes to derive his statements from the works of the Inquisitors themselves; yet Fra Paolo, the Italian historian of the council of Trent, whose hypocrisy made him conceal the mind and heart of a Protestant under the cowl of a Catholic friar, and Dellon, the famous Protestant author of the too famous "Relation of the Inquisition at Goa," are among his favorite authors for reference! And when he does cite the works of the inquisitors themselves, such as Eymerick, Pegna, &c., he garbles the extracts, quoting only what suits his purpose, very often extracting only the concluding sentence from a lengthy passage, and thereby often making the inquisitors say just the contrary of what they had intended. This wretched cutting up of quotations is unpardonable in a work so extensive; it would have been bad enough in a duodecimo, but in a folio volume it is utterly inexcusable, and is a strong evidence of bad faith in the writer.

---

[1] See Brandt's History, copious extracts from which are cited in the Oral Discussion of Hughes and Breckenridge, on the second question.

No wonder that Voltaire and the infidels of France received the book with enthusiasm. It was just the kind of work they wanted. Its whole tendency was to throw odium on the Catholic priesthood, whom it represented as gloating over the blood of their victims. But we are a little surprised that the Abbé Marsollier, a cotemporary French Catholic priest, should have presented it, in an abridged form, to the French people in their own language, and that many very estimable French writers should have been misled by its statements. A morbid appetite seems to have seized upon the French people about that time. Writers, male and female, published works on Spain. Madame d'Aunoy wrote a book remarkable for its gross inaccuracy, in regard to the Spanish Inquisition, and for its caustic ridicule of everything Spanish. The Abbé De Vayrac, who had spent twenty years of his active life in Spain, answered these misrepresentations in his famous work "L'Etat present d'Espagne," published at Amsterdam, in 1719, 4 vols. 12mo. He proved that the statements of Limborch and Madame d'Aunoy, in regard to the Spanish Inquisition were greatly exaggerated, or positively false. No one was better calculated to write on Spanish affairs, than the Abbé; but so vitiated was the taste of his day, even in France, that the work caused a great outcry, and the author had to encounter a storm of opposition. In the preface to a second edition of his work, he ably defends himself from charges made against his statements under five different heads; with what effect on his cotemporaries, history does not tell. It is much to be regretted that this work of De Vayrac is not more generally known.

But the most popular history of the Spanish Inquisition among the enemies of this tribunal, is that by Don Juan Antonio Llorente, published at Paris, 1818, in four volumes, 8vo. A brief sketch of this remarkable man's life, will show us what motives prompted the publication of this work. He was born at Calahorra in Spain, A. D. 1756. He studied for the Church, took the degree of bachelor in theology, with considerable credit, and was ordained priest at an early age. A singular incident occurred at his ordination: after the consecration in which he had recited the sacred words of Christ, together with the ordaining bishop, he was seized with a sudden illness, which prevented his receiving the holy communion: some viewed the occurrence as ominous. His first work after ordination was a comedy "on matrimony,"[1] which, however, at the earnest solicitations of a friend, he consented to burn. When subsequently vicar general of the diocese of Calahorra, he composed another comedy, and had it acted on the stage, very little to the edification of the people and of the clergy of that city. So great was his passion for this kind of writing, that when afterwards wholly engaged in politics, he employed his leisure hours in translating into Spanish many of the unchaste poems of the lascivious Casti! His was a troubled and restless spirit. Not content with his retirement at Calahorra, he proceeded to Madrid, where he spent his time intriguing for place. He succeeded, and rose step by step, until he became secretary of the Inquisition at Madrid, an office which he held from 1790 to 1792. Having been guilty of a grievous betrayal of the confidence reposed in him by the Inquisitor General, and of several other irregularities of conduct, he was ordered to leave Madrid, and to repair to his native place.

---

[1] El Matrimonio a desgusto.

Here he was equally restless and intriguing. Detected by the Spanish government in a secret correspondence with the emissaries of the French republic in 1793, and suspected of other misdemeanors, he was arrested, and sent by the Inquisition, not into a dungeon, but merely into a retired convent of the Recollects at some distance from Calahorra, to compose in solitude his restless spirit and to do penance for his sins. Among his writings which were seized, several were found against the Spanish government, against the Holy See, and against the Inquisition. And yet, strange cruelty of the bloody Inquisition! upon his writing letters full of repentance and abject submission, he was released from his place of retreat, and again received into favor. He now made his appearance at court, and pushed his fortunes more rapidly than ever. By the aid of powerful friends, he was soon created canon of Toledo, and received the cross of the order of Charles III. At the court of Ferdinand VII., he was loaded with honors; and yet, on the first invasion of the French, he sought out Murat, their commander in chief, turned traitor to his country, and ranged himself on the side of her enemies! He repaired to Bayonne to pay his court to the new king, Joseph Buonaparte, took the oath of fidelity to him, and was appointed one of his secret counselors. He now gave himself up entirely to politics; abandoning every ecclesiastical function, some say, even doffing the ecclesiastical habit.

Charged by Joseph Buonaparte with a commission for the suppression of the convents in Spain, he discharged his office with *singular* zeal and efficiency. In 1809, he was ordered by Joseph to write a history of the Spanish Inquisition, and he was no doubt well paid for his labor. He knew well what kind of a work would suit the palate of his royal master, and what kind of a work he was *expected* to write. He set about his task with great ardor; but owing to the expulsion of the French from Spain, and to other causes, he was not able to complete it until nine years later. He fled to Paris with his royal patron, and after having taken temporary shelter in England, he returned to Paris, after the treaty of Vienna, in 1815.

Nothing shows more fully his restless ambition and his total want of principle, than the course which he now adopted. Finding that the sun of the Buonaparte family had set forever, he determined again to pay his court to that Ferdinand whom he had abandoned and betrayed! He employed his usual weapon of low adulation, wrote a genealogical table of the royal family, and addressed letters full of flattery to the king and to the chapter at Toledo. But all was unavailing: his letters remained unnoticed. Then it was that he gave way to all the bitterness of his spirit He wrote his portraits of the Popes, full of invective and misrepresentation. When accused of gallantry with a French countess, at the age of sixty-six, his friends defended him on the ground that he had previously married her, though he was a priest who had vowed celibacy! He was finally banished from France, by the French government, for improper conduct,[1] and died shortly after at Madrid, February 25th, 1823, in the sixty-seventh year of his age. Had the Spanish government and the Inquisition been such as he had represented them, he would not perhaps have been permitted to re-enter Spain, and to terminate his life peacefully in his own country.

Such was Llorente, a traitor to his country, and probably to his religion; who tried to play off, in Spanish affairs, the same part that Talleyrand did in those of France, but failed for want of the genius of the latter. He was in Spain the counterpart of Fra Paolo in Italy, and of Courayer and Du Pin in France. Could we expect an impartial history of the Spanish Inquisition from such a man? He alters texts to suit his own purposes, and gives us only his own word for most of his statements. To show how little his assertions are to be relied on, in a pamphlet published at Paris in 1818, he boldly asserted that, between the years 1700 and 1808, the Spanish Inquisition had immolated at the stake no less than fifteen hundred and seventy-eight victims. This is not only a gross exaggeration, but a manifest misstatement.[2] Since the accession of the house of Bourbon to the Spanish throne in 1709, it would be difficult to prove that *one* victim was so immolated, or suffered capital punishment in any other way, through the agency of the Inquisition; and neither Llorente nor any other man has furnished proofs to the contrary. During this period, and for a long time previous, the chief inmates of the Inquisition were state prisoners guilty of high political misdemeanors, who had either accused themselves of imaginary crimes against religion, to avoid the greater rigors of the civil courts, or had been sent there by the Spanish government in order to prevent the *eclat* of a public trial. The terrible Inquisition thus became little more, under the Bourbon dynasty in Spain, than a department of the police.

Among the writers who have defended the Spanish Inquisition, besides the Abbe De Vayrac, mentioned above, Count De Maistre,[3] and La Cordaire,[4] are the most distinguished. The works of both these conspicuous men are already before the American public, and it is unnecessary to offer much comment on them. La Cordaire devotes two chapters of his work to the Inquisition, of which he treats only in its connection with his main subject — the defence of the order of St. Dominic. He adduces few facts or arguments, which had not been already ably handled by De

---

[1] The writer of his life, prefixed to his "History of the Inquisition," ascribes his banishment from France to the persecution of the French clergy. Mr. Prescott hints at the same cause. But we think that the true cause is to be found in his own restless ambition, and the jealousy of the French government.

[2] Mr. Prescott detects many gross historical inaccuracies in Llorente, unconnected with the Inquisition, in painting which, according to him, he was never at fault! See Prescott, vol. i, p. 250, *note*; vol. ii, p. 108, *note*.

[3] In his "Letters on the Spanish Inquisition."

[4] "Apology for the order of St. Dominic," 18mo, p. 143.

Maistre, whose work had been considered by many as the best which has ever appeared on the subject. Its chief fault is its brevity. We rise from its perusal with a desire to know more. Perhaps, too, the author has indulged rather too much in philosophic speculation, and has advanced some principles for the defence of the odious tribunal, which its enemies would scarcely admit. Had he been less apparently solicitous to defend everything connected with the Inquisition, and had he given up certain things, which are wholly indefensible, his work would have carried with it a greater appearance of candor and plausibility. Catholicity never can be injured by the truth. There is also a certain vagueness, and something that savors of inconsistency. Thus, for example, in his last letter, he says: "The tribunal of the Inquisition is purely royal," and yet a little farther on, he remarks, quoting from the report of the Cortes: "These tribunals (the Inquisition) are thus at once ecclesiastical and royal," &c. He meant to say, what the truth of history warrants, that of the two tribunals of the Inquisition the royal is predominant, and generally paramount in its authority; but it would have been better to have been more explicit. Notwithstanding these defects, the work of De Maistre is still excellent, and no one can peruse it without thinking better of the Inquisition.

The best compendious view of the subject which we have ever seen, is an essay by John Murary, inserted in a late work published by him in London.[1] But a full, fair, and extensive history of the Inquisition,—one that might, by its learning, serve as an antidote to those of Limborch and Llorente,—is still a *desideratum* in our Catholic literature. It requires the extensive learning and patient research of a Dr. Lingard, or a Dr. Wiseman, to dispel the clouds which have hung around the tribunal for centuries, and to present to the world, in the terse and condensed style of the one, or the copious and luminous details of the other, such a history as the importance of the subject demands.

Yet enough has been already published to enable us to detect many of the inaccuracies of Mr. Prescott, in his history of the "Modern Inquisition" in Spain. To attempt to review all of his statements in detail, would swell this essay to an unwarrantable length: we will confine ourselves to certain general erroneous views, which pervade the entire history, cover the whole ground of the controversy, and include the minor inaccuracies. We have already endeavored to trace the sources of these errors in the authors whom he has chiefly followed.

Mr. Prescott views the Inquisition as a religious, and not as a political institution;[2] ascribes its establishment, notwithstanding the repugnance of Isabella, to the importunities of the clergy,[3] and the fanaticism of the people, demanding the sacrifice of the Jews, through selfish motives and religious hatred of that race;[4] and he more than intimates that the tribunal, with all its laws and proceedings, was but a carrying out of the principles of the Catholic Church.[1] He presents[2] a very dark picture of its forms of trial, of the presumptive proofs of Judaism, of the various forms of torture, and of the awful "*autos da fe*," giving only those details which were calculated to make the institution appear odious, and mixing up with his account of the original Inquisition, established by Ferdinand and Isabella, many forms and abuses, which, if they ever existed at all, certainly belong to a much later period. To make the Catholic church appear in a still more odious light in the whole matter,[3] he says, that the Roman Pontiff, Sixtus IV., was moved to the publication of his first bull regarding the Inquisition, in 1478, by "the sources of wealth and influence which this measure opened to the court of Rome."

---

[1] A compendium of modern geography, 1 vol. 8vo, p. 398.

[2] Vol. 1, p. 245, note. At least he asserts this in regard to the Inquisition established in Castile.

[3] Vol. 1, pp. 249, 250, *et seq.*

[4] Ib. pp. 243, 244, *et seq.*

To these charges most of the others may be reduced. These are the shades: we will endeavor to exhibit some of the lights of the picture. We will accordingly now proceed to establish, by summary proofs, the three following propositions, which, it will be seen, are diametrically opposed to the assertions of Mr. Prescott. *Audi alteram partem*,— hear the other side:—

I. The Spanish Inquisition was mainly a political institution, and the result of extraordinary political circumstances.

II. Its cruelties have been greatly exaggerated.

III. The Catholic Church is not responsible for the institution itself, much less for its abuses, real or alleged.

I. It requires but a slight acquaintance with Spanish history to be convinced of the fact, that the Inquisition in that country was an instrument of state policy, employed under circumstances of high political excitement. The causes which led to its establishment had been steadily operating for nearly eight hundred years. In 711, the Moors had invaded Spain, seized upon its finest provinces, driven the original inhabitants into the mountains of the Asturias, and fastened a galling foreign yoke upon the neck of a hitherto free people. But the Spaniards did not tamely submit to foreign oppression: with the stern, unyielding perseverance which belongs to their national character, they maintained the unequal contest with the enemy which had overpowered them and crushed their liberties. From the council held by the fugitive Spanish chiefs in the cave of Cavadonga, in 711, to the conquest of Grenada, in 1492, the great struggle for the mastery continued between the two races with but little intermission. Never was there a contest of so long a continuance, or which resulted in a political hatred so deep and abiding. It was a civil and a border war, between two races which could never amalgamate, because kept asunder by different religions, different temperaments, and different interests. The Spaniards were fighting for their liberties, for their firesides, and their altars: the Moors sought to annihilate the one, and to pollute and desecrate the other. All prisoners taken in war by the latter were sold into bondage in Morocco, and religious orders were established by the Christians for the redemption of these forlorn captives. The war thus assumed a religious cast, and the military orders of St. Iago, of Calatrava, and of Alcantara, were established among the Spaniards to keep up the crusade against the enemies of their country and of their religion.

---

[1] Ibid. vol. i, pp. 245, 246, 248, and *passim* throughout the chapter.

[2] Ib. p. 255, *et seq.*

[3] Ib. p. 248.

Can we wonder that, under all these circumstances, the Spaniards should have had a deadly political hatred of the Moors? Can we be surprised that, when this great struggle was approaching its crisis in the brilliant reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, and when, for the first time for seven hundred and eighty-one years, the Spanish nation had a fair opportunity to shake off the yoke, this political feeling should have increased to a fearful excitement? And that this excitement should have manifested itself in the establishment of a tribunal of great severity, to assist the government in ferreting out the Moors, and in expelling them from the country? We are rather surprised, that so much moderation was evinced under circumstances so exciting. After the conquest of Grenada, in 1492, the Moors were allowed the free exercise of their religion, and it was only after repeated rebellions, both in Grenada, and in different parts of the ancient Moorish kingdom of that name, that the Spanish government resorted to the extreme measure of leaving the Moors no alternative but to embrace Christianity or leave the country.[1] The bitter experience of nearly eight centuries had convinced the Spaniards that the name of a Moor was identified with that of a traitor and enemy of his country and of religion.

Intercepted letters in cipher proved that, after the conquest of Grenada, the Moors were concerting with their brethren in Africa measures for regaining their lost power in Spain. The Jews, who were very rich, who were scattered all over Spain, and were intermarried with the most opulent Spanish families,[2] were also deeply engaged in these plots.[3] They were, if possible, more odious in Spain than the Moors themselves. They were, likewise, accused of other crimes of dreadful atrocity: of kidnapping Christian children,[4] and of selling them into bondage into Africa, and even of feasting on the flesh of infant Christian babes, at the celebration of their passover![5] They had monopolized the trade of the country, and, by usury and extortion, had fattened on "the spoils of the Egyptians" (Christians), in Spain. As early as the year 1391, popular indignation against this unhappy people had burst forth into an insurrection, in which many of them were massacred. Other countries witnessed similar scenes about the same time.[6] The expulsion of the Jews from

---

[1] Mr. Prescott admits this, but still labors to prove that the indiscreet seal of Cardinal Ximenes led him to adopt such measures for proselytizing the Moors of Grenada, as infringed the treaty made with them, and stimulated them to rebellion. Yet the facts he alleges scarcely prove this. Prescott, vol. ii, ch. 6.

[2] See report of Cortes.

[3] Mr. Prescott says, vol. i, p. 186, that they were accused "perhaps with reason," with having facilitated the first Saracenic invasion.

[4] Similar charges were made against the Moors after the conquest of Grenada. See an interesting paragraph in Prescott, vol. i, p. 253.

[5] See Prescott, vol. ii, p. 186.

[6] See Prescott, vol. ii, p. 152; note. Was Frederic the Great, of Prussia, actuated by religious bigotry, in expelling the Jews, in the last century?

Spain, was demanded by the popular voice; but the government, content with some severe measures of precaution against them, resisted this appeal for nearly a hundred years, and it was only after the Jews were known to be leagued with the Moors for the subversion of Spanish liberty, and after they had been detected in writing a libel[1] on the Spanish government, that the edict for their banishment was published, and the tribunal of the Inquisition established to carry it into execution.

In order the better to understand this whole history, let us put a parallel case. Suppose the Indian tribes on our western frontier should invade one of our western states, should subdue the finest portion of it, and drive such of the original inhabitants, as had not fallen under the tomahawk and scalping knife, into remote and unproductive portions of the state. Suppose that they should establish a new government on the ruins of the old, and that a bloody border war should be carried on for centuries between them and the original inhabitants, and that these should at length succeed in regaining their lost territory. But to make the parallel complete, suppose that among the whites, a large and opulent party should be found leagued with the Indians, and employing every intrigue to maintain *their* usurpation, would any one be surprised if this party should become more odious than the Indians themselves? And if popular indignation should be enkindled against them, even before the expulsion of the Indians, would it not be perfectly natural? But if the Indians, after having been subdued, should be suffered to remain in the country with all their national usages untouched, and should be expelled, only after repeated attempts on their part, to regain their lost dominion; would not this be viewed as an evidence of unwonted lenity? And, if even after this continued treachery, they should be still suffered to remain in the country, provided they would conform to the religion and usages of the whites, would we not consider it a clemency, astonishing even in this age of boasted refinement? For the whites expelled from their homes, substitute the Spaniards; for the Indians, substitute the Moors, and for the treacherous party among the whites, the Jews; and the case will apply to the condition of Spain, on the establishment of the Inquisition.

Leopold Rankê, an unexceptionable Protestant witness, gives the following opinion concerning Llorente and the Spanish Inquisition: —

> "Llorente has given us a famous book on this subject, and if I may presume to say anything that contravenes the opinion of such a predecessor, let my excuse be that this well-informed author wrote in the interest of the *Afrancesados*,[2] of the Josephine administration. In that interest, he disputes the immunities of the Basque provinces, though these were hardly to be denied. In that interest too, he looks on the Inquisition as an usurpation of the spiritual over the secular authority. Nevertheless, if I am not altogether in error, it appears, even from his own facts, that the Inquisition was a royal court of judicature, only armed with ecclesiastical weapons.

---

[1] Mr. Prescott mentions this fact, vol. i, p. 249. But why hide away in a note a fact, which had so great an influence on the destiny of this miserable people?

[2] The Spanish party devoted to French interests.

"In the first place, the inquisitors were royal officers. The kings had the right of appointing and dismissing them; the kings had, among the various councils at their court, a council likewise of the Inquisition: the courts of the Inquisition were subject, like other magistracies, to royal visiters; the same men were often assessors therein, who sat in the supreme court of Castile. It was to no purpose Ximenes scrupled to admit into the council of the Inquisition a layman nominated by Ferdinand the Catholic. 'Do you not know,' said the king, 'that if this tribunal possesses jurisdiction, it is from the king it derives it?' * * *

"In the second place, all the profit of the confiscations by this court accrued to the king. These were carried out in a very unsparing manner. Claims were laid even to the presents which had been made by the condemned long before their trials, and to the portions they had bestowed on their daughters. Though the *fueros* (privileges) of Aragon forbade the king to confiscate the property of his convicted subjects, he deemed himself exalted above the law in matters pertaining to this court. It was calculated in the year 1522, that the property of those alone who had voluntarily pleaded guilty of heresy, had, even in the short period since the accession of Charles, brought him in upwards of a million of ducats. The proceeds of these confiscations formed a sort of regular income for the royal exchequer. It was even believed and asserted from the beginning, that the kings had been moved to establish and countenance this tribunal, more by their hankering after the wealth it confiscated, than by motives of piety.

"In the third place, it was the Inquisition, and the Inquisition alone, that completely shut out all extraneous interference with the state; the sovereign had now at his disposal a tribunal, from which no grandee, no archbishop, could withdraw himself. Foreigners were particularly struck with this fact. 'The Inquisition,' says Segni, 'was invented to rob the wealthy of their property, and the powerful of their consequence.' As Charles knew no other means of bringing certain punishment upon the bishops who had taken part in the insurrection of the *Communidades*,[1] he chose to have them judged by the Inquisition. Philip II., despairing of being able to punish Antonio Perez, called in the aid of the Inquisition. For open heresy was not the only question it had to try. Already Ferdinand had felt the advantages it afforded, and had enlarged the sphere of its activity. Under Philip it interfered in matters of trade and of the arts, of customs and marine. How much further could it go, when it pronounced it heresy to dispose of horses or munition to France?

"Accordingly, as this court derived its authority from the king, it directed it to the advantage of the royal power. It was a portion of those spolia of the ecclesiastical power, by which the government was made mighty; such as the administration of the grand masterships,[2] and the appointment of the bishops. It was in spirit, and tendency above all, a political institution. THE POPE HAD AN INTEREST IN THWARTING IT; AND HE DID SO, AND AS OFTEN AS HE COULD. But the king had an interest in constantly upholding it."[3]

This was a merely religious tribunal, forsooth! The whole texture of its constitution was as political as was its origin. The king named the

---

[1] The Communes, who were struggling for their rights and liberties, (*fueros*) against the encroachments of royal prerogative. The bishops took the side of the people in the contest;—a fact as striking as it is honorable.

[2] Of the military orders, which were very rich and influential.

[3] "The Ottoman and Spanish Empires in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; by Leopold Ranke, etc." Philadelphia Lea and Blanchard; 1845, p. 78-9.

Inquisitor General, who, with the *approval of the king*, named the subordinate officers of the tribunal. The whole institution was under the control of the royal council, without the sanction of which it was powerless: while the king with his council could stay any prosecution, or crush any process at will. So manifest was it to the whole world, that this tribunal was a local political institution, growing out of circumstances peculiar to Spain, and designed only for the Jews and Moors, that when subsequently the Spanish government, under Philip II., sought to establish it in Milan, the people revolted, exclaiming "that it was tyranny to impose on a Christian city, a form of Inquisition designed for Moors and Jews."[1] And so intimately was it connected with Spanish politics, that the great Charles V., in a codicil to his will, recommended it specially to his son Philip II., as an institution "upon which the safety of Spain depended."[2] In 1812, the famous convention of the Spanish Cortes, assembled for drafting a new constitution, appointed a special committee to draw up a report on the Spanish Inquisition. The learned men who drew up this able document, were no doubt well acquainted with Spanish history and politics, and they are unexceptionable witnesses on another account,—they were violently opposed to the Inquisition. Yet they assert, that "it was an institution demanded and established by the monarchs of Spain in difficult and extraordinary circumstances."[3] And M. Guizot, a famous historian, and, though a Calvinist, the late prime minister of Catholic France, says: "that it was at first more political than religious, and destined to maintain order, rather than to defend the faith."[4]

II. Much more might be said on this branch of the subject, but we must hasten to the proofs of the second proposition, in which we will endeavor to show that Mr. Prescott has drawn too dark a picture of the Inquisition,—of its forms of procedure, and of its abuses and cruelties. Our limits will allow only a bare statement of the facts: our readers will readily make the comments. Far be it from us to defend many abuses of this tribunal, which, as we shall show, the Popes and the Church uniformly condemned. Under the circumstances of extraordinary excitement which gave rise to the Inquisition, it was natural to expect some unnecessary severity; and the authority of the famous Spanish historian Mariana, who details those acts of rigor, is thus easily explained. Again, when Philip II., about sixty years later, re-established the tribunal with renewed severity, we may look for many abuses. But these two periods of excitement were, thank heaven, of very short duration, and the severities then resorted to are not a fair criterion, whereby to judge of the general character of the Inquisition. At other times, many of its rigorous laws were often, like some of the grotesque forms of jurisprudence adopted by the Venitian republic, a mere dead letter, retained on the statute book, *in terrorem*.

---

[1] Limborch, Book 1, ch. 27. [2] Ibid, B. 1, ch. 30.

[3] They also declare that "no decree (of the Inquisition) could be published without the consent of the king." (Report Cortes in 1812).

[4] "Elle fut d'abord plus politique que religieuse, et destinée a maintenir l'ordre plutot qu'a defendre la foi." Cours d'histoire moderne. Paris, vol. 5, Lect. 11.

That the abuses of the Inquisition have been greatly exaggerated, we prove by the express words of that arch-enemy of the tribunal, Voltaire,[1] whose testimony Mr. Prescott cites with so much complacency, to prove that the wicked measures of princes have generally originated in the evil counsels of their confessors.[2] We prove it by another unexceptionable witness, Mons. Bourgoing, sent by the French republic in 1789, as minister plenipotentiary to Spain. He was violently opposed to the Inquisition, and yet he says:[3] "I will acknowledge, in order to give homage to truth, that the Inquisition might be cited in our days, as a model of equity." This avowal, however unpalatable to himself, and to his employers, was wrung from him only by the stern evidence of truth. Our third witness is Philip Limborch, whose character we have given above. Out of a very long list of criminals condemned by the Spanish Inquisition, during a very long period, he admits that only fifteen men and four women were executed, and most of these for treason, witchcraft, sacrilege, or other crimes than heresy.[4] From this fact we draw two inferences: first, that the rigid laws of the Inquisition were very feebly executed; and secondly, that a very small proportion of the criminals were tried for heresy. The Roman Pontiff, Clement X., in a bull published in 1672, enumerates the offences for which persons might be proceeded against by the Inquisition, and it is remarkable, that out of thirteen different classes of crimes only one is heresy.[5] If our readers be inclined to smile at the prominent place assigned to witchcraft, sorcery, &c,, by the Pontiff, we ask them only to remember the history of the Salem witchcraft.

Of the two courts of the Inquisition, the civil and the ecclesiastical, the latter was in fact strictly a court of equity. The motto on its banner, "Mercy and Justice," was indicative of its character. "Mercy" was first offered to the culprit, and if he would not accept it, he was delivered over to the "Justice" of the civil court; but even then, with great reluctance, and always with a recommendation to "Mercy."[6] Before the accused was arrested at all by the Inquisition, it was necessary to have the sworn evidence of three different witnesses, each of whom was required to swear that he was actuated by no malice, and that he did not act in collusion with any other person.[7] And both the accusers, and the officers of the Inquisition were subject to excommunication, if they were guided by malice, or any other unworthy motive[1]. It was only after the deposition of the third witness, that the accused was summoned, when if he disproved the charges, he was released. If he failed to do so, he was still released, if he declared his repentance. If, after being released, he was again arraigned in the same manner as at first, and was convicted a second time, he was again pardoned on repentance.[2] It was only on the third conviction, by three different sets of witnesses, each consisting of three, that he was finally delivered over to the civil court, to be judged for the offense.[3]

---

[1] His words as given in the French "Dict. des Sciences," are remarkable. "Sans doute, qu'on a imputè a un tribunal si justement detestè, des exces d'horreurs qu'il n'a pas toujours commis: mais c'est etre mal adroit, que de s'elever contre l'Inquisition par des faits douteux, et plus encore, de chercher dans le mensonge de quoi la rendre odieuse."—"Without doubt writers have imputed to a tribunal so justly detested horrible excesses which it has not always committed; but it is very injudicious to decry the Inquisition by doubtful facts; and still more so to seek to render it odious by falsehood." And yet this is precisely what all the enemies of the Inquisition have done, and none more so than Voltaire!

[2] Vol. i, ch. 6, p. 246.

[3] "Picture of Spain," reviewed by the French "Journal des Debats," of September 17, 1805. See La Cordaire's Apology, &c. p. 117.

[4] See Fletcher's notes to De Maistre's first letter.

[5] Bullarium Rom. T. vii, p. 185.

[6] Some authors think, without any reason, that this was a mere form. Jurieu, the famous French Calvinist, in his "History of the Papacy," Tom. ii, ch. 6, admits the fact.

[7] Simancas, Institutiones Catholicæ. Tit. xliv. p. 380, Edit. Romæ, 1575, 4to. This work had great

The chief motive for secrecy in the proceedings of the tribunal, was a wish that the civil court might gain no knowledge of the facts, until the ecclesiastical court had exhausted every expedient for reclaiming the delinquent. And so far was this secrecy carried, that there is no evidence to prove that, when the criminal was handed over to the secular court, the evidence elicited before the ecclesiastical tribunal was even so much as communicated, to his prejudice. A trial altogether new seems then to have commenced before the civil court, and it was only at this stage of the prosecution, that the cruel practice of torturing the accused was resorted to. Ecclesiastics were not concerned in the infliction of punishment: it was contrary to the spirit of their order, and to the express laws of the Inquisition itself.[4] So that Mr. Prescott's frightful picture of the clergy applying the torture to their victims is, at best, but a fancy sketch.[5]

The practice of torturing the accused, in certain cases, was then almost universal in the jurisprudence of all nations. It was a part of the civil law, was embodied in the Theodosian and Justinian codes, and had the sanction of Ulpian, and other distinguished expounders of these codes. It had been borrowed from the old Roman jurisprudence. The Church did much

---

authority among the early Inquisitors. The testimony of the several witnesses was carefully noted down, and diligently sifted, and if on being again called, as they often were in the progress of the examination, they did not confirm the previous statement in every particular, their testimony was set at naught. Nor was the previous record of their testimony again read to them, but they were left entirely to their memory. If, under this rigid scrutiny, they were detected in equivocation, self contradiction or perjury, they were liable to imprisonment, and to other severe penalties. See Simancas, p. 338.

[1] Benedict X., in a special bull, renewed these censures, and reserved the absolution from them to the Holy See.

[2] Even P. Limborch, cited by Fleury, admits that the criminal was twice pardoned, by the ecclesiastical court, on his repentance.

[3] Some of the courts required only two, but the more general practice demanded three unexceptionable witnesses, for each conviction. True, witnesses of suspicious character were sometimes allowed to testify, but their testimony was received only for what it was worth;—"*qualem qualem probationem*," as Simancas says. It might afford conjectural evidence, and might aid in eliciting something more conclusive; but of itself, it never could cause the conviction of the accused. (Simancas, Tit. li, p. 419.) In fact, to condemn the accused, the clearest evidence, and the most unexceptionable testimony, were always required; "*probationes luce clariores requiruntur.*" (Simancas, Ibid. p. 418)

[4] The maxim, *Ecclesia abhorret a sanguine*, The Church abhors bloodshed,—is a standing principle of the canon law, by which the clergy were specially bound. So far was this maxim carried that clergymen were forbidden to practise surgery, or even to bleed a patient. And yet, in the face of this evidence, the Catholic clergy must still be represented as thirsting for blood!

[5] In fact, he confounds the proceedings of the two courts throughout, barely remarking in a note on page 225, that Ferdinand had established a supreme council to supervise the proceedings of the subordinate tribunals. Why this important omission?

to mitigate this and many other odious features of the civil law, and many distinguished men, such as Ludovicus Vives, condemned the whole practice as cruel and unjust.[1] Tortures were employed by the civil courts of the Inquisition, only in extreme cases, and then more to prompt the repentance, than to bring about the condemnation of the accused.[2] The confession elicited under torture could not be used against the accused, unless he voluntarily confirmed it three days afterwards, according to the usage of the Spanish courts.[3] If he would not confess, he was generally acquitted.[4] The application of the torture was restricted within very narrow limits, and all abuses in inflicting it were severely condemned,[5] and they subjected the officers, thus transcending their powers, to the obligation in the forum of conscience, as well as in that of the public courts, of repairing all injury done to those thus tortured.[6]

In one word, the ecclesiastical court of the Inquisition was but preparatory. The final decision of the case always took place before the civil court, which alone inflicted the punishments ordained by the Spanish laws. The former court had only to decide, whether there was sufficient reason to have the accused indicted before the latter. It performed very much the same office as our modern grand juries, with these important differences, that it took cognizance only of a certain class of offenses connected with religion, pardoned twice whenever the criminal gave satisfactory signs of repentance, and never *presented* but when there was no hope of reforming the offender. Where will you find any civil court thus lenient?[7] It is a thing unheard of in modern judicial proceedings; and yet the Inquisition is to be held up to scorn as the most cruel of all tribunals! Count Pollnitz, in his very interesting memoirs,[8] is astonished at the ideas Protestants entertain on a subject about which they know so little. "For my part, I own to you I cannot imagine in what the barbarity consists, which you Protestants attribute to the Inquisition. On the contrary it is, in my opinion, the mildest and most lenient tribunal that exists." And he assigns the same reason that we do above, appeals to his own observation in Catholic countries, and hints at the opposite spirit of the Calvinistic consistory of Geneva. This was in fact an Inquisition which *never* forgave; and the English court of high commission prosecuted the inoffensive Catholic with a rigor that never relented, no matter how much the victim cried out for mercy! Even Mr. Prescott allows that Elizabeth's Inquisition equalled in severity that established by Ferdinand and Isabella[9]. That fact is, the former far outstripped the latter in every respect; and the English are the last people under the sun who should talk about the Spanish Inquisition.[1] And yet they precisely have raised the greatest clamor on the subject.

---

[1] Simancas, Tit. lxv. p. 495, *et. seq.* [2] Ibid, Tit. lxv. p. 496. [3] Ibid, p. 509.

[4] Ibid, p. 510. [5] Ibid, p. 497.

[6] For an account of the instruments of torture employed against the Catholics of England under Elizabeth and her successors, for more than one hundred years, see Lingard's England—Elizabeth, Butler's Book of the Catholic Church, Cobbett's Letters, &c. England was the last country in Europe to abolish the barbarous custom of burning at the stake, an instance of which occurred as late as the ninth year of George II. And yet Englishmen dare talk of the cruelties of the Spanish Inquisition!

[7] So equitable was the ancient Inquisition, that the Order of the Templars, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, sought to be judged by it in preference to any other court.

[8] Pollnitz's "Memoirs," volume iii, quoted in Fletcher's notes to De Maistre.

[9] Prescott, vol. iii, p. 202.

It is not true that counsel was not allowed to the party accused;[2] it is not true that the articles of accusation were not shown to him;[3] it is not true that he had not proper means of defence allowed him. Finally, though the *autos da fe* were bad enough, yet the picture of them which represents the clergy assisting in order to enjoy the agony of the victims, is as unjust as it is fanciful. They attempted to soothe, not to aggravate the sufferings of the condemned, as ministers of all denominations at the present day accompany the culprit to the scaffold. These are the principal erroneous charges against the Spanish Inquisition, many of which Mr. Prescott has revived. When presenting a sketch of the form of trial by the Inquisition, why did he make so many important omissions? Why present even the few facts which he does give, with a coloring which indicates a prejudice more worthy of the fierce religious acrimony of the sixteenth century, than of the refinement and goodly feeling of the present day?

III. But the most mischievous part of Mr. Prescott's account of the Spanish Inquisition is that, in which he deliberately charges on the Catholic Church, not only the institution itself, but even its cruelties and abuses. Nothing could be more unjust. The Inquisition is connected with no doctrine of the Catholic Church, nor is it even a part of her discipline. It was never established in any country without the concurrence of its temporal rulers. In Spain the people and the Cortes demanded its establishment from the king, as the *only* remedy to the desperate political evils of the country.[4] Ferdinand and Isabella, according to Limborch,[5] "earnestly solicited the Roman Pontiff," to allow them to name inquisitors for their dominions. It is doubtful whether the Pontiff, Sixtus IV., could have effectually resisted an appeal made with so much earnestness, and involving a matter so intimately interwoven with the welfare of Spain. He heard the petition, and issued the bulls demanded, in 1478; but, on the appeal of the Jews against the excessive severity of the inquisitors, he issued another bull in 1481, in which "he rebuked their intemperate zeal, and even threatened them with deprivation."[6] A little later, Pope Leo X. received the petition of the Arragonese, stating their grievances under the operation of the Inquisition, and granted the prayer thereof by a special bull, by which he greatly modified the form of the whole tribunal, and restrained the powers of the inquisitors; but to show how powerless the Pope was in this matter, the Emperor Charles V. annulled the papal decree by his royal authority![1] But the Popes succeeded better in regard to Naples, over which they had more political influence; they steadily opposed the introduction of the Inquisition into that kingdom, and after a long struggle with the Spanish monarchs, they gained the victory.[2] It was Charles V., and not the Pope, who established the Inquisition in Sicily.[3] It was the Senate of Venice, and not the Pope, that established the Inquisition in this republic.[4]

---

[1] See Lingard's England, Elizabeth; Butler's "Book of the Catholic Church;" Cobbett's Letters, and De Maistre's fifth and sixth Letters, for proofs on this subject.

[2] Simancas, Tit. xliv. p. 332, from whose testimony it appears that, in the Spanish courts, counsel was not only allowed, but that he had unreserved communication with the accused for three days, in order, with his aid, to prepare suitable answers to the different charges of the indictment.

[3] This is admitted by the writer of a most virulent article in the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, Article, Inquisition. Mr. Prescott admits it too, but with a qualification which destroys the force of the admission; vol. i, p. 257. See Simancas, Tit. xliv, p. 332, where this is asserted without any qualification.

[4] See Report of Cortes.

[5] Limborch, b. i, ch. 24.

[6] Prescott, vol. i, p. 264.

The general policy of the Popes deprecated severity towards sinners and those who had wandered from the true faith. The Bullarium Romanum is full of proofs of this assertion. Our limits will allow but a few of the most prominent facts. As early as 1268, we find Pope Clement IV. disapproving of the severe laws against blasphemy enacted by the sainted French monarch, Louis IX. Various Popes sought to protect the Jews from the insults and injuries to which they were liable from the populace, in various countries in Europe. Thus Honorius III., in 1217,[5] published a bull in which he forbade, under the severest ecclesiastical penalties, any one to force them to be baptized against their will, or to offer any other indignity to their persons, or injury to their property.[6] The Bull of Martin V., published in 1425,[7] in which they were declared liable to various penalties, if they persevered in buying and selling Christians, as they were accused of having done, did not, however, revoke the acts of his predecessors in favor of that obdurate race. As a proof of the clemency of the Roman Pontiffs towards the Jewish people, there is a proverb current among the latter to this day, that "Rome is the paradise of the Jews."

In regard to the Inquisition in Portugal, the Popes maintained a long struggle with the Portuguese monarchs before they would at all consent to its establishment, and then they did so *with regret*, according to the testimony of Antonio Sousa, cited by Limborch.[8] And after it had been established, they did everything in their power to mitigate its severity. Thus we find Clement X., in 1674–5, in separate bulls,[9] receiving appeals from the decisions of the Portuguese tribunals, and threatening deprivation and other penalties to the inquisitors, if they persisted. When the latter proved disobedient to the papal mandate, we find Innocent XI., the successor of Clement X., enforcing the decree of his predecessor against them (A. D. 1679), and declaring their acts null and void.[10] In another bull published in 1681,[11] the same Pontiff corrects many abuses which had crept into the Inquisition of Portugal, and makes many salutary enactments for the guidance of the inquisitors. Among these, one gives to the accused the privilege of selecting other counsel, if that assigned by the Inquisitorial court be not agreeable to him, and enjoins that the new counsel have free access to his client; and another directs that the prisoners be treated with greater mildness, that the prisons be less dark, and the confinement less rigid. More evidence might be adduced to prove what we have above asserted, but we must stop here.[1]

---

[1] Report of Cortes.

[2] Limborch, b. i, ch. 26.

[3] Ibid. b. i, ch. 27.

[4] See La Cordaire, *sup. cit.* p. 125.

[5] Bullarium Rom. tom. iii, p. 191.

[6] Those who wish to see more on this interesting subject are referred to Guerra, Pontificiarum Constitutionum Epitome, vol. i, p. 191, *et seq.*, Edit. Venitiis, 1772, 4 vols folio.

[7] Bullarium Rom. tom. iii, p. 453.

[8] B. i, ch. 25.

[9] Bull. Rom. tom. vii, pp. 266, 271, and 312.

[10] Ibid. tom. viii, p. 96.

[11] Ibid. p. 230.

In the face of all these facts, is it not very unjust, to charge the Popes, or the Catholic Church, with the abuses of the Inquisition? It is certain that they did everything in their power to restrain the excesses of that tribunal; and if they frequently failed, it was the fault of temporal princes and of the times, not of the Church. One fact in regard to the Spanish Inquisition, would alone suffice to show how utterly unable the Pope, and even a general council of the Catholic Church was to reverse one of its decisions. While the council of Trent was in session, Bartholomew Caranza, archbishop of Toledo, was arrested by the Inquisition and confined in prison on a charge of heresy. The interference of Pius IV., and the protest of the council of Trent, were unavailing; the Inquisition was inflexible, and the archbishop was released only after eight years, by order of Philip II.[2] If this fact does not prove that the Church had no control over the Spanish Inquisition, we are at a loss to know what could prove this proposition.

Mr. Prescott[3] attributes perfidy and interested motives to the Roman Pontiffs in their relations towards the Spanish Inquisition. No assertion could be more groundless. The Popes never derived any emolument from the inquisitorial tribunals; it was one of the standing rules of the "Supreme Roman Inquisition," established by a bull of Paul III., in 1542,[4] that its decisions should be given *gratis* in every case. In establishing this supreme court, the Pontiff revoked all inquisitorial powers, and laid down such rules as were well calculated to prevent every abuse. And though three hundred years have elapsed since the establishment of this court, it would be difficult to point to an instance in which it ever pronounced sentence of capital punishment.[5] The only thing for which it has ever been blamed, is its very delicate treatment of the great Galileo, when a clamor was raised against him by jealous rivals whom he had eclipsed.[6] Such was the conduct of the Popes at home, where they had the power to act according to their own judgment, untrammelled by the political intrigues of princes.

The comparatively weak and imbecile condition of Spain for the last century, has been ascribed to the Inquisition. If such be the case, how are we to explain the fact, that for two hundred years after its establishment, Spain was the first country in Europe? The decline of Spain may be traced, with greater probability, to other causes. The emigration of her people to America, the influx of wealth from her colonies, and the consequent decline of industry among her population, contributed, with various other well known causes, to lower her in the scale of European nations. We often hear of the number of victims who were immolated by her Inquisition, but we are not told of the far greater number who fell in the various religious wars by which Germany, France, and England were convulsed, while Spain was secured by this institution from the acrimonious controversy in which those wars originated![1] Where the Spanish Inquisition immolated one victim, the Moloch of religious dissension has immolated whole hecatombs!

---

[1] For more on this subject, see Guerra, p. 175, *et seq.* This author has, however, omitted to notice several papal bulls regarding the Inquisition.

[2] See La Cordaire, Apology, etc. pp. 183–4.

[3] Vol. i. pp. 248 and 267.

[4] Bull. Rom. tom. iv. p. 211.

[5] See Bergier's Dict. de Theologie, Art. Inquisition, where he makes this same assertion even more strongly, and challenges any one to produce a proof to the contrary.

[6] See La Cordaire, Apology, p. 184, and Dublin Review for July, 1838.

We cannot think that Mr. Prescott would have hazarded many of the aspersions on the Catholic Church with which his book is filled, had he been fully aware of the facts above stated. He might have learned a lesson of moderation in this respect from his illustrious countrymen, Bancroft and Irving, especially as the Inquisition, the cause of his indignation, no longer exists. We regret still more the faults of his book, because it will descend to posterity as a standard work of American literature, of which his country may justly be proud. It is time for all of us to learn the lesson of forbearance taught by the Gospel, and confirmed by the bitter experience of the past. Have the Protestant sects been immaculate on the score of religious persecution, in regard to the mother Church, or even in regard to each other? If they have, then may they rail at the Spanish Inquisition! But if they have some misgivings on the subject, then would we say to them in the language of our blessed Lord addressed to the Scribes and Pharisees, who sought the death of the woman taken in adultery: "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone."

---

[1] See Muzzarelli, "Il buon uso della logica," etc. vol. v, p. 108, for a beautiful passage on this subject.

XII. THE REFORMATION IN SWITZERLAND.—BERNESE INTRIGUES.*

The late religious war in Switzerland — Policy of France and Austria — Intrigues of England — Character of the War — Whence the liberties of Switzerland — Analogy between the late struggle, and that preceding the Reformation — Berne the centre of operations — M. de Haller's point of view — His character as an historian — His authorities — Wavering of Berne — Tortuous policy — How she embraced the Reform — The *bear* and the *pears* — Treacherous perjury of Berne — Zuinglian Council — Its decrees — Religious liberty crushed — Riot and sacrilege — Proceedings of Bernese commissioners — Downright tyranny — The minister Farel — His *fiery* zeal — An appalling picture — A parallel — Priests hunted down — Character of the ministers — Avowal of Capito — The glorious privilege of private judgment — How consistent! — Persecution of brother Protestants — Drowning the Anabaptists — Reformation in Geneva — Rapid summary of horrors — The Bernese army of invasion — The sword and the Bible — Forbearance of Catholics — Affecting incident at Soleure — The war of Cappell — Points of resemblance — An *armed* apostle — A prophet quailing before danger — Battle of Cappell — Death of Zuingle — Triumph of Catholic cantons — Treaty of Peace.

THE exciting occurrences which took place in Switzerland a few years ago, caused the eyes of the whole civilized world to be directed to that most interesting country. All Europe stood looking on with the most lively interest, while those scenes were enacting; and France and Austria, with their powerful armies, hovered over the Swiss frontiers, ready to interpose in case of necessity;—whether to stay the onward progress of anarchy and civil war, or to turn the course which events might take to their own advantage.

And these two great Catholic powers, after witnessing the noble heroism with which the Catholic Swiss at first successfully repelled the army of invaders, which came to assail their dearest rights, and to pollute their very firesides, could calmly look on and see those same noble heroes finally succumb to overwhelming numbers! Without striking a blow, or even entering a serious protest, they could see the ancient liberties of Switzerland crushed in the dust, and its brave defenders bowed down under the yoke of a most degrading slavery! The vile intrigues of England gained for her the diplomatic victory; and the Catholic cabinets, at her bidding, consented ignobly to sacrifice the cause of right and justice to that of mere political expediency. The spirit of chivalry had fled, and the weak, nobly struggling for their altars and their liberties, were permitted to be overwhelmed by the strong; might thus gaining the day over right.

---

* *Histoire de la revolution religieuse, ou de la reforme Protestante dans la Suisse Occidentale.* Par Charles Louis de Haller, ancien membre du conseil souverain, et du conseil secret de Berne, chevalier de l'ordre royal de la legion d'honneur, et de celui de Charles III. d'Espagne, &c. *History of the religious revolution, or of the Protestant Reformation, in Western Switzerland.* By Charles Louis de Haller, former member of the supreme and of the secret councils of Berne, Knight of the royal order of the legion of honor, and of that of Charles III. of Spain, &c. 4th edition. Paris, 1839. 1 vol. 12mo, pp. 436.

It is admitted on all hands, that, in the disturbances to which we allude, the Protestants were the aggressors, and that the Catholics acted only on the defensive. Lucerne, the principal Catholic canton of the confederacy, claimed the right of managing her own educational concerns without the interference of her neighbors; this right was clearly guaranteed to her by the fundamental articles of the Swiss confederation; and she resolved to maintain it at all hazards. If the Catholic Lucerners thought proper to entrust the education of their children to the Jesuits, what right had the Protestants of Argovia, Berne, and Bâle Campagne to object? What right had the latter to say to the former, you shall not employ these teachers, but you shall employ such as may be agreeable to *our* taste? Yet they did thus wantonly and rudely interfere with what was clearly not their business; but they received a lesson which may serve as a warning to all busy meddlers in future.

In the late desperate attempts to subvert the constitution, and to crush the very independence of Lucerne by force, this brave old Catholic canton, assisted by its faithful allies of Schwytz, Uri, Zug, and Unterwald, proved to all the world that it could fight as well as pray; and that Catholicity, far from enervating, had strengthened its primitive vigor and courage. The old Catholic cantons proved themselves worthy descendants of those noble patriots who had fought at Morgarten, under the victorious banners of Tell and Fürst. These Catholic heroes had laid the foundations of Swiss independence, in the beginning of the fourteenth century; and with their watch-word, LIBERTY, they had ever proved terrible to their foes, and unconquerable in battle. The fierce Gorgón of despotism had not dared, for centuries, to desecrate, with his foul footsteps, the soil beneath which rested the mortal remains of those soldiers of freedom; nor to pollute, with his pestilent breath, that pure and bracing air of the mountains, which was itself the most appropriate emblem of the pure, and lofty, and untrammeled patriotism, cherished as their own heart's blood by the brave, sturdy, and enthusiastic Swiss mountaineers.

How could the Protestant reformation hope to pervert such men as these? It might easily gain over to its standard the comparatively effeminate, and the far more worldly-minded and corrupt inhabitants of the plains; it could never proselytize the unsophisticated children of the mountains. These prized their religion as dearly as they did their ancestral glory; in fact, the two were intimately associated together in their minds, as they had ever been in the heroic period of their history. It was the Catholic religion which had inspired the ardent patriotism, stimulated the noble courage, and nerved for battle the brawny arms of Tell and his associates; it was the Catholic religion which had crowned the victors with laurel, had celebrated the triumphal disenthralment of the country by its splendid services of thanksgiving, and had erected the public monuments which commemorated the victory. Bending reverently before the altar of his God, and falling prostrate before the Lamb offered up thereon, the Swiss hero had prayed with confidence for victory; and he had there, too, returned his fervid thanks to God, when victory had been finally won by his good sword blessed by heaven.

No wonder, then, that Lucerne and the other Catholic cantons could not brook to be dictated to by their neighbors, in matters involving the free exercise of their religion. No wonder that they were willing to shed the last drop of their blood, rather than have the bright jewel of faith torn from their bosoms, or than wear, riveted upon their necks, the galling yoke of a religious despotism.

The late war in Switzerland was a religious war, in which one party was struggling for its religious independence, and the other, for the establishment of a religious ascendency. That such a struggle should have happened a hundred years back, would create little or no surprise; but that it should have occurred in our own day; in this enlightened and tolerant nineteenth century; in this *enlightened age of dollars and cents*, in which almost every thing else is valued more highly than religion;—is indeed not a little astonishing. It might even seem that this age was awaking from its lethargic stupor of indifference, and was putting on once more something of that religious zeal and enthusiasm which whilom animated the crusaders. But such was really not the case. The awakening was only local, partial, and fitful; it was but a momentary outburst of a religious bigotry as blind as it was hateful, on the one side; and of a religious enthusiasm for self-defense, both deep and determined, on the other. It was a fitful war of two great conflicting elements in society—*anarchy* and *order*. Order at first triumphed; but anarchy finally gained the day!

It would be but a very imperfect and short-sighted view of the subject, to consider the late Swiss disturbances as merely isolated events, unconnected with the past history of Switzerland. To understand them aright, we must look back three hundred years, to the period when the great religious revolution, called by courtesy the *reformation*, swept over that country, scattering broadcast upon its once peaceful and happy soil the prolific seeds of dissensions, and divisions, and civil wars. There is no more doubt that all the evils, all the bitter feuds, all the rancorous civil broils, and nearly all the bloodshed of Switzerland during the last three centuries, have sprung from the reformation, than there is of this other fact, that all the previous liberty, and peace, and glory of the country, had sprung from the great political revolution effected by Catholics in the beginning of the fourteenth century. These two great revolutions are the starting points of Swiss glory and of Swiss disgrace.

It is with this view that we now proceed to present some of the leading facts in the early history of the Swiss reformation; a revolution, as we sincerely believe, pregnant with infinite mischief of every kind to the Swiss confederation.

Zurich was the first city in Switzerland which embraced the reformation; or, as M. de Haller expresses it, she was "the mother and the root of all religious and political Protestantism in Switzerland."[1] She was nearly

[1] Page 434.

eight years in advance of Berne in the race of reform; and it was through her influence mainly that the latter at length consented to accept the new gospel. But once Berne had embraced it, she far outstripped her preceptor in religious zeal or fanaticism; and she took the lead in all the subsequent religioso-political affairs of the country. Her central position, her rich and extensive territory, her untiring industry, and her adroit and unscrupulous diplomacy, gave her the ascendency over the other Protestant cantons, and made her the leader in every great enterprise. It was through her intrigues that Geneva was induced to receive the new doctrines; it was by her triumphant physical power that the reformation was thrust down the throats of the good Catholic people of Vaud. Bernese preachers, escorted by Bernese bailiffs and spies, traversed all the north-western cantons, scattering dissension wherever they went, and establishing the new gospel, either by intrigue or by force, wherever they could. Cautiously and cunningly, but with an industry that never tired, and a resolution that never faltered, Berne pursued her Machiavellian policy; until, by one means or another, about half of the Swiss confederation was torn from Catholic unity, and bound at the same time, by strong political ties, to herself. Thus she became the great leader of the Protestant, as Lucerne has ever been that of the Catholic cantons of Switzerland.

It is from this elevated point of view, that M. de Haller looks down upon the history of the Swiss reformation. Himself a Bernese, and, until he became a Catholic,[1] a Bernese counsellor as high in power and influence as he was in wisdom and talents, he was eminently qualified to write a history of the religious revolution in Switzerland. Candid and moderate by nature, of an enlarged mind and comprehensive genius, his scrupulous veracity has not been denied even by his strongest opponents; while he certainly had every opportunity to become thoroughly acquainted with the events he relates. He assures us in his preface, that his history "cannot be taxed with exaggeration, for it has been faithfully derived from Historical Fragments of the city of Berne, composed by a Bernese ecclesiastic (Protestant); from the History of the Swiss, by Mallett, a Genevan Protestant; from that of Baron d'Ált, a Catholic, it is true, but excessively reserved upon all that might displease the Bernese; and above all, in fine, from the History of the Reformation in Switzerland, by M. Ruchat, a zealous Protestant minister and professor of belles-lettres at the academy of Lausanne, to whom all the archives were opened for the composition of his work."[2]

This last named writer, whom he quotes continually, was a most violent partisan of the Swiss reformation; and yet even he was compelled to relate a large portion of the truth, mixed up, as usual, with much adroit and canting misrepresentation. Thus he asserts, among other things, "that the Catholic religion is idolatrous and superstitious, and that it cannot be sustained but by ignorance, by interest, by violence, and by fraud."[1] M. de Haller meets the injurious charge, not by asserting, but by *proving*, from undeniable evidence, that the Swiss reformation was established precisely by these identical means, and that it could not, in fact, have been established otherwise. He says:—

---

[1] For having become a Catholic, he was expelled from the council, probably in order to prove Protestant love of liberty!

[2] P. ix.

> "Protestants of good faith — and there are many such among our separated brethren — will judge for themselves, from a simple exposition of facts, whether it was not rather their own religion which was introduced by ignorance, interest, violence, and fraud: by *ignorance*, for it was every where the ignorant multitude that decided, without knowledge of the cause, upon questions of faith and discipline, and this was carried so far that even children of fourteen years were called to these popular assemblies; by *interest*, for the robbery of churches, of temples, and of monasteries, was the first act of the reformation; by *violence*, for it was with armed force that altars were overturned, images broken, convents pillaged, and it became necessary to employ fire and sword, confiscation and exile, in order to make the new religion prevail over the ancient belief; by *lying* and by *fraud*, for Luther and Zuingle formally recommended both to their followers as means of success, and their counsel has been followed with fidelity and perseverance even unto our own day. We will now pass on to the facts and the proof."[2]

We defy any one to read attentively M. de Haller's work, without admitting that he has triumphantly proved all this, and even more, by facts and evidence derived mainly from Protestant sources. Our limits will not, of course, allow us to go into all the details of the evidence; yet we hope to be able to furnish enough to convince any impartial mind that M. de Haller's position is entirely sound and tenable. But first we must glance rapidly at the manner in which the reformation was first introduced into Berne; which, as we have already intimated, subsequently exercised so strong an influence, both religious and political, on other parts of Switzerland.

It was slowly and cautiously that Berne embraced the new doctrines. Long did she resist the intrigues of the Zurichers, and the wily arts of their new apostle, Ulrich Zuingle. This man understood well the character of the Bernese; their wary distrust of any thing new, their deeply seated self-interest, and their dogged obstinacy in maintaining whatever they finally settled down upon. He well knew all this, and he acted accordingly. Writing to Berchtold Haller, the first herald of the new gospel at Berne, he advised moderation and caution; "for," says he, "the minds of the Bernese are not yet ripe for the new gospel."[3] In a letter subsequently addressed to Francis Kolb, he uses this quaint language, alluding to the cantonal type of Berne — the *bear*:—

> "My dear Francis! proceed slowly, and not too rudely, in the business; do not throw to the *bear* at first but one sour pear along with a great many sweet ones, afterwards two, then three; and if he begin to swallow them, throw him always more and more, sour and sweet, pellmell.

---

[1] Quoted by de Haller, Pref. x.

[2] Pref. x. and xi. He gives us in a note, besides some curious facts about Zuingle, the following passage from a letter of Luther to Melancthon, dated August 30, 1530: "When we will have nothing more to fear, and when we shall be left in repose, we will then *repair all our present lies, our frauds, and our acts of violence.*"

[3] Quoted by de Haller p. 18.

Finally, empty the sack altogether; soft, hard, sweet, sour, and crude; he will devour them all, and will not suffer any one to take them away from him, nor to drive him away."[1]

Zuingle understood his men, and his arts succeeded even beyond his most sanguine expectations. Berne vacillated for several years between truth and error; her policy was wavering and tortuous; but at length she threw her whole influence into the scale of the reformation; and once she had taken her position, she maintained it with her characteristic obstinacy.

Though her counsels were often uncertain, yet, in the main, she had continued faithful to the old religion up to the year 1527. On the 26th of January, 1524, we find her delegates uniting with those of the twelve cantons at Lucerne in a strong decree, *unanimously* passed, for the maintenance of Catholicity.[2] Shortly afterwards, she listened with respect to the voice of the three Catholic bishops of Constance, Bâle, and Lausanne, who strongly urged the cantons to remain steadfast in their faith, and who promised "that if, in lapse of time, some abuses had glided into the ecclesiastical state, they would examine the matter with unremitting diligence, and abolish the abuses with all their power."[3]

In 1525–6, the terrible revolt of the peasants took place in Germany, and penetrated even into Switzerland. It had certainly grown out of the revolutionary principles broached by the reformers, and it was headed by Protestant preachers, as M. Ruchat, himself a preacher, admits in the following passage: "Having at their head *the preachers of the reform*, they pillaged, ravaged, massacred, and burnt every thing that fell into their hands."[4] Sartorius, another Protestant historian of Germany, admits the same.[5] All social order was threatened with annihilation by these wild fanatics, whose number was legion; and Berne, appalled by the danger, made a temporary truce with her tergiversation, recoiled from the precipice, on the brink of which she had been standing, and fell back on her old vantage ground of conservative Catholicity. On the 21st of May, 1526, her grand council published an edict for the preservation of the old religion, and its members bound themselves, *by a solemn oath, to maintain it inviolate.*"[6]

Yet, in the following year, Berne revoked this decree, violated this solemnly plighted oath, joined the reformation, and lent her whole influence to its propagation throughout Switzerland! Her wavering ceased all of a sudden, and her policy, hitherto tortuous and always unprincipled, now became firmly settled. Not only she declared for the reformation, but she spared no labor, no intrigue, no money, — nothing, to make it triumph every where. It was mainly through her subsequent efforts, that the reformation was fastened on a large portion of the Swiss republic. By what means this was accomplished, we have already intimated; and now we will furnish some of the principal specifications and evidence bearing on the subject. The facts we are going to allege clearly prove this great leading feature of the Swiss reformation: — that it was only by intrigue, chicanery, persecution, and open violence, that it was finally established at the city of Berne and throughout the canton, as well as in all the other cantons where Bernese influence could make itself felt.

---

[1] Quoted by de Haller, p. 18, note.

[2] Ibid, p. 22.

[3] Ibid., p. 23.

[4] Ibid., p. 23.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid, ch. iv, p. 27 seqq.

In 1528, a conference, or rather a species of Zuinglian council, was held at Berne, for the purpose of deciding on the articles of faith to be adopted in the proposed reformation. Zuingle was the master spirit of the assembly, at which very few Catholics assisted. Ten articles, or *theses*, were there adopted by the ministers; but, though drawn up with studied ambiguity and vagueness, they were still signed only by a minority of the Bernese clergy, the majority still clinging to the old faith. Yet the Bernese grand council of state not only adopted and confirmed these articles, but enjoined their adoption on all the people of the canton. Pastors and curates were forbidden to teach any thing opposed to them; the mass was abolished, altars were to be demolished, images to be burnt, and the four bishops of Switzerland were declared deprived of all jurisdiction! Moreover, priests were permitted to marry, and religious persons of both sexes to leave their convents; the ministers were ordered to preach four times each week under penalty of suspension; and finally the council reserved to itself the right "to change this new religion if any one would prove to them any thing better by the Scriptures."[1]

Such was the tenor of the famous Bernese decree, by which the new gospel was first *established by law*. Nor did it remain a dead letter. Violence, sacrilege, and robbery rioted throughout the canton. The churches of the Catholics were forcibly seized on, the altars were overturned, the beautiful decorations of paintings and statuary were defaced or broken to pieces, people were forbidden any longer to worship at the altars and shrines of their fathers; and very soon the whole canton presented the appearance of a country through which an army of Vandals and Huns had but lately marched. It is a certain and undoubted *fact*, that the reformation was *forced* upon the Bernese people, against the positive will of the majority! But the minority were active, untiring, revolutionary, and they had the civil authorities to back them; the majority were often indifferent and negligent; their natural protectors, the more zealous among the clergy, had been compelled to fly; and thus left alone, a flock without shepherds, the people were at length wearied out and harassed into conformity.

To enforce the new religious law, commissioners were sent from Berne into all the communes of the canton, with instructions to address the people, and to use every effort to induce them to embrace the new gospel. After their harangues, the matter was to be immediately put to the popular vote, boys of fourteen years being entitled to the privilege of suffrage! If the majority went for the new gospel, even if this majority consisted but of one voice, the minority were compelled to abandon the old religion, and the mass was declared publicly abolished throughout the commune! If, on the contrary, the majority, as was often the case, in spite of every entreaty and threat, went for the old religion, the Protestant minority still remained free to practice publicly their worship. Moreover, in this latter case, the vote of the commune was again taken by parishes, in order that those in which the majority were Protestants might be protected by the civil authority. Even if a commune voted unanimously in favor of Catholicity, the possibility of practising their religion was taken away from the Catholics by the banishment of their priests, and the stationing amongst them of Protestant preachers; or if their Bernese Excellencies graciously allowed them to retain their pastors, it was only for a time and until farther orders![1]

---

[1] Ibid. pp. 52, 53.

We ask whether all this was not downright tyranny of the worst kind; and whether our assertion made above was at all exaggerated? But this is not yet all, nor even half. There were in Switzerland certain cities and districts under the joint government and control of Berne, Friburg and other Catholic cantons. To these Berne sent out her emissaries, both religious and political. If they could be gained over to the new religion, they would probably throw off the yoke of their Catholic joint sovereigns, and fall solely under the government of Berne, to say nothing of the spiritual good which would accrue to their souls from the new gospel. Hence no money nor intrigue was to be spared to proselytize them.

The fiery minister, Farel, armed with Bernese passports, and accompanied or sustained by Bernese deputies and bailiffs, ran over these common cities and districts, with the impetuous fury of one possessed by an evil spirit. He stirred up seditions whithersoever he went, either against the old religion or against himself; and his progress was every where marked by conflagrations and ruins. In the bishopric of Bâle, in several towns and communes belonging to the present canton of Vaud, in Soleure, and elsewhere, this furious fanatic and political firebrand agitated society to its very depths, and lashed popular passions into a fury which was entirely uncontrollable. Wherever the populace could be won over to his party, or even overawed into silence, he caused the mass to be abolished, churches to be stripped, pillaged, and sacrilegiously desecrated, and altars to be overturned! And the Bernese authorities not only calmly looked on, but they even sanctioned all these ferocious deeds, and cast the shield of their protection around the person of Farel.[2]

Insurrections and violence every where marked the progress of the reformation. Look, for instance, at the following graphic picture of Switzerland during the epoch in question, drawn by M. de Haller:

> "During the years 1529, 1530, and 1531, Switzerland found herself in a frightful condition, and altogether similar to that of which we are now witnesses, three centuries later. Nothing was seen everywhere but hatred, broils, and acts of violence; everywhere reigned discord and division; discord between the cantons, discord in the bosom of the governments, discord between sovereigns and subjects, in fine, discord and division even in every parish and in every family. The defection of Berne, at which the Zurichers had labored for six years, had unchained the audacity of all the

---

[1] Ibid. pp. 52, 54.

[2] See ibid. p. 71 seq., for detailed proofs of all this.

19

meddlers and bad men in Switzerland. On all sides new revolutions broke out; — at Bâle, at St. Gall, at Bienne, at Thurgovia, at Frauenfeld, at Mellingen, at Bremgarten, even at Gaster and in the Toggenburg, at Herissau, at Wettingen, and finally at Schaffhousen. Everywhere they were brought about by a band of poltroons or at least of ignorant burgesses, both turbulent and factious, against the will of the intimidated magistrates, and of the more numerous and peaceable portion of the inhabitants who looked upon these innovations with horror, but whose indignation was arrested and whose zeal was paralyzed, as happens during our own days, by a pretended necessity of avoiding the effusion of blood, and preventing the horrors of a civil war. Thus one party declared an implacable war against their fellow-citizens and every thing that is sacred, while the other was condemned to suffer without resistance all manner of injuries, all manner of hostilities; and this state of triumphant iniquity and of miserable servitude was qualified by the fine name of peace. Everywhere, except at Schaffhousen, a city which was always distinguished for its tranquillity and the peaceful character of its inhabitants, seditious armed mobs rushed of their own accord to the churches, broke down the altars, burnt the images, destroyed the most magnificent monuments of art, pillaged the sacred vases as well as other objects of value, and put up for public sale at auction the sacred vestments: by such vandalism and by such sacrileges was the religious revolution of the sixteenth century signalized."[1]

Just imagine that the United States were densely populated and filled with cities, and that the Catholic religion were that of the people; but that a religious revolution had been effected in one of our great cities, — say Philadelphia, — by violence, sustained by the civil authorities; that there all our churches had been pillaged and desecrated, a part of them burned down and the other part seized on for the Protestant worship; that the frensy spread, until similar scenes were enacted in half the cities and towns of our republic; imagine, in a word, the Philadelphia riots, aggravated a hundred fold, extending through half the country, and keeping the people in a state of anarchy and civil war for more than twenty years; imagine our hitherto peaceful republic broken up by discord, and bathed in the blood of its citizens, until at last the fierce rioters sit down in triumph amidst the ruins they had every where strewn around them; and you will then have some faint conception of the rise, progress, and triumph of the Protestant reformation in a large portion of Switzerland! Recent events, both in this country and in Switzerland, have proved that Protestantism has not yet lost all of its original fierceness, and that its turbulent spirit has not been yet entirely subdued by the onward march of refinement and civilization.

As might have been anticipated, the Bernese met with frequent resistance in their efforts to destroy the old religion, and to force the new one on the people. Popular insurrections broke out at Aigle, and in the bailiwicks of Lentzburg, Frutigen, Interlaken, and Haut-Siebenthal, as well as in other places. How was this resistance met? It was crushed by main force, probably with a view to demonstrate to all the world how sincerely the Bernese were attached to the great fundamental principles of the reformation,—that each one should read the Bible and judge for himself! As M. de Haller says:

---

[1] Pp 62—64.

> "An edict of persecution was issued, which directed that images should be everywhere broken and altars demolished, as well in the churches as in private houses; *that priests who yet said mass should be everywhere hunted down*, seized on wherever they could be caught, and put in prison; that every one who spoke badly of the Bernese authorities should be treated in like manner; for, says M. Ruchat, the Catholics of the canton and vicinity declaimed horribly against them. In case of relapse, the priests were outlawed and delivered up to public vengeance: in fine, the same edict decreed punishment against all who should sustain these refractory priests (that is, all who remained faithful to the ancient religion), or who afforded them an asylum. A third edict of the 22d December, forbade any one to go into the neighboring cantons to hear mass, under penalty of deprivation for those who held office, and of arbitrary punishment for private individuals."[1]

Was ever tyranny and persecution carried further than this? And yet this is but one chapter in the history of the Swiss reformation. The same ferocious intolerance was witnessed wherever the reformation made its appearance, in the once peaceful and happy land of William Tell. Did our limits permit, we might prove this by facts, as undeniable as they are appalling. Those Catholic priests who were not willing to betray their religion, or to sell their conscience for a mess of pottage, were everywhere thrown into prison or banished the country. They were succeeded by preachers, many of them fugitives from France and Germany, and most of them men of little learning and less piety, remarkable only for a certain boldness and rude popular eloquence or declamation. Men of this stamp, who had suddenly, and often without vocation or ordination, intruded themselves into the holy ministry, could not hope to win or secure the confidence of the people. Accordingly, we find the following candid avowal on the subject, in a confidential letter of the minister Capito to Farel, written as late as 1537. He says:

> "The authority of the ministers is entirely abolished; all is lost, all goes to ruin. The people say to us boldly: you wish to make yourselves the tyrants of the Church, you wish to establish a new papacy. God makes me know what it is to be a pastor, *and the wrong we have done the Church by the precipitate and inconsiderate vehemence which has caused us to reject the Pope.* For the people, accustomed to unbounded freedom, and as it were nourished by it, have spurned the rein altogether; they cry out to us: we know enough of the gospel, what need have we of your help to find Jesus Christ? Go and preach to those who wish to hear you."[2]

The intolerance of the Protestant party was surpassed only by its utter inconsistency. The glorious privileges of private judgment, of liberty of conscience and of the press, were forever on their lips; and yet they recklessly trampled them all under their feet! Each one was to interpret the Bible for himself, and yet he who dared interpret it differently from their Excellencies, the counsellors of Berne, was punished as an enemy of the government! The counter principle of a union of church and state, was even openly avowed and constantly acted on. The council of ministers, held at Berne in 1532, subscribed a confession of faith drawn up by Capito, in which the following remarkable passages are found:

---

[1] Pp. 57, 58.

[2] Epistola ad Farel. inter epist. Calvini, p. 5; quoted by de Haller, p. 99, note.

> "The ministers acknowledge *that it is not possible for them to produce any fruit in their church, unless the civil magistrate lend his assistance to advance the good work*. . . . Every Christian magistrate ought, in the exercise of his power, to be the lieutenant and minister of God, and to maintain among his subjects the evangelical doctrine and life, so far at least as it is exercised outwardly and is practised in external things.[1] . . . . The magistrates should then take great care to preserve sound doctrine; to prevent error and seduction, to punish blasphemy and all outward sins affecting religion and conduct, to protect the truth and good morals."[2]

This forcibly reminds us of the doctrines of the *nursing fathers*, so much spoken of, even in our American Presbyterian Confession of Faith. As some additional evidence of the love which the Swiss reformers bore to the liberty of the press and to that of conscience, read the two following extracts from our author:

> "The Bernese, who had talked so much about the liberty of conscience and that of the press while it was a question of establishing the reform, then sent deputies to Bâle to complain of the libels which were there printed against the deputies of Berne, and they demanded that silence should be imposed on the preachers unfavorable to the reform. Thus it is that the Protestants did not wish to allow liberty to any one, so soon as they became the masters. The Bernese deputation was, however, dismissed from Bâle without having attained its object."[3]
>
> "In virtue of the freedom of conscience, the triumphant innovators removed all the Catholic counsellors, and forbade any one to preach against what they called the reform. At Bâle, in particular, the nobility were driven away, and the Catholic clergy, the chapter, and even the professors of the university, abandoned forever a city of which they were the ornament and the glory, and which owed to them its lustre and its very existence."[4]

Those who were guilty of the unpardonable crime of adhering tenaciously and fondly to the time-honored religion of their fathers, were not the only ones who felt the smart of Protestant intolerance in Switzerland. Brother Protestants were also persecuted, if they had the misfortune to believe either more or less than their more enlightened brethren, who happened to be orthodox *for the time being*. The Anabaptists, in particular, were hunted down with a ferocity which is almost inconceivable. The favorite mode of punishing them, especially at Berne, was by *drowning!* This manner of death was deemed the most appropriate, because it was only baptizing them in their own way![5] The rivers and lakes, which abound in Switzerland, often received the dead bodies of these poor deluded men. Sometimes, however, this mode of punishment was dispensed with in favor of others less revolting to humanity. Says M. de Haller:

> "Their Excellencies of Berne, not being able to convince the Anabaptists,

---

[1] De Haller, p. 97. He quotes Ruchat.

[2] Ibid p. 100.

[3] Pp. 58, 59.

[4] P. 64.

[5] See pp. 39, 69, *et alibi passim*.

found it much more simple to banish them, or to throw them into the water and drown them. These punishments having, however, rather increased than diminished their number, the council of Berne, being embarrassed, resorted to measures less severe, and *acting under the advice of the ministers*, published on the 2d of March, 1533, an edict announcing that the Anabaptists should be left in peace, if they would keep their belief to themselves, and maintain silence; but that if they continued to preach and to keep up a separate sect, they should not be any longer condemned to death, *but only to perpetual imprisonment on* BREAD AND WATER! This was certainly a singular favor. Catholics, who are accused of so much intolerance, had never molested the Zuinglians who had kept their faith to themselves, and even when these openly preached their doctrines from the pulpit, they were not condemned either to death or to perpetual imprisonment on bread and water."[1]

As we have already said, the progress of the Swiss reformation was everywhere marked by intrigues, popular commotions, mob violence, and sacrilege. So it was at Geneva, into which the reformation was introduced in the year 1535, chiefly again through the intrigues of Berne. It was not Calvin who established the reformation at Geneva; he only reaped the harvest which had been sown by others. The fiery Farel, shielded with the panoply of Bernese protection and acting in concert with Bernese envoys, had already succeeded in there subverting, to a great extent, the ancient faith. And by what means? We have not room for full details, for which we must refer our readers to a very interesting chapter in M. de Haller's history.[2] Suffice it to say, that the whole city was thrown into commotion; that the Catholic churches were violently seized upon, after having been first sacrilegiously defaced and desecrated in the hallowed name of religion; that the Catholic clergy were hunted down and forced to fly the city; that nearly half of the population was compelled to emigrate, in order to secure to themselves peace and freedom of conscience; that even after they had emigrated, their property was confiscated and they were disfranchised, in punishment for their having *dared* leave the city; that the harmless nuns of St. Clare, after having been long harassed and insulted by the mob, were also compelled to leave their home and to seek shelter elsewhere; that the Catholic church property was seized upon by the reformed party; that, after having filled the whole city, and especially the churches, with the "abomination of desolation," Farel and his *pious* associates were able to assemble congregations and to preach, in only *two* out of the many Genevan churches of which they had obtained possession; that even in these they often preached to empty benches, so great was the horror which all these multiplied sacrileges inspired in the popular mind; and that, finally, the reformation was established in Geneva by the great council, and afterwards by the swords and bayonets of the Bernese army, which entered the city in 1536!

Such were the first fruits of the reformation in Geneva. In the canton of Vaud, which was invaded and subdued by the Bernese army in the same year, the proceedings were, if possible, still more violent, and the policy still more truculent. Wheresover the Bernese army marched, there the reformation was established by force of arms. The Bernese bore the sword in one hand and the Bible in the other; and they established the new gospel in Vaud pretty much after the Mohammedan fashion of proselytism!

---

[1] Pp. 153, 154.

[2] Chap. xvi.

M. de Haller proves all this by an array of evidence, which can neither be gainsayed nor resisted.[1] He proves it from the testimony of Ruchat, Mallet, Spon, and other Protestant historians. He furnishes FACTS, with names, dates, and specifications; *facts* as clear as the noonday sun; *facts* which we challenge any one to deny or contravene. And we ask, whether it be at all likely that a reformation effected by such means, was, or could possibly have been, the work of God? Could God have chosen such instruments and such means to effect His work? Could He smile on commotions, on riots, on robbery, on impurity, on broken vows, on sacrilege? Gracious heavens! How much do those delude themselves, who still cling to the belief that the reformation was the work of God! Well may we address to them, and to all who may chance to read these pages, the emphatic words of St. Augustine prefixed to the title-page of M. de Haller's work: "Let those hear who have not fallen, lest they fall; let those hear who have fallen, that they may rise!"[2]

If it be alleged, that the Catholics too sometimes resorted to violence and appealed to the sword; we answer that they did so, almost without an exception, only in necessary self-defense. Their forbearance, amidst all the terrible outrages which we have briefly enumerated, was indeed wonderful. If they sometimes repelled force by force; if they flew to arms more than once in their own defense, it was surely competent for them to do so. Their lives were threatened, their property was invaded, their altars were desecrated; and surely, when considerations such as these urged them to buckle on their good swords, they were not only excusable, but they would have been arrant cowards had they failed to do so. And no one has ever yet dared to taunt with cowardice the brave mountaineers of Lucerne, Schwytz, Uri, Unterwald, and Zug, who inherit the faith, the country, and the unconquerable spirit of William Tell. The recent occurrences in Switzerland prove that this spirit has not flagged in the lapse of centuries, that Catholicity is not incompatible with bravery; and that soldiers who pray, both before and after battle, are under the special protection of the great God of battles; though He, for His own wise and inscrutable purposes, may permit them sometimes to be overwhelmed by superior numbers.

But whoever will read M. de Haller's history must be convinced, that the Swiss Catholics were much more forbearing and tolerant than the Swiss Protestants. The former, in general, allowed the latter the free exercise of their religion in places where these were in the minority; whereas there are, indeed, but few instances on record, where the latter accorded the same privilege to the former under similar circumstances. Did our limits permit, we might go fully into the comparison, and prove the accuracy of our remark by undeniable evidence. But we must be content with a marginal reference,[1] and with the following touching anecdote, the scene of which is laid in the city of Soleure.

---

[1] See p. 271 seqq. and 321 seqq.

[2] Audiant qui non ceciderunt, ne cadant; audiant qui ceciderunt, ut surgant.

The Protestant party had sought to gain the ascendency in this place, by entirely overthrowing the Catholic religion. For this purpose they seized upon the moment when nearly all the members of the council were absent, for entering into a conspiracy to take possession of "the arsenal and of the Franciscan church, to surprise the priests in their bed, and to massacre all the Catholics in case of resistance."[2] The conspiracy was, however, discovered to the *avoyer*, or chief magistrate, left in charge of the city—Nicholas de Wengi; and he took every prudent precaution against the meditated attack. On the 30th day of October, 1533, at one hour after midnight, the conspirators rushed to the assault; but they were amazed to find nearly half the city turned out ready to receive them, and to defend themselves to the last extremity. After a sharp encounter, in which the arsenal was successively taken and retaken, without, however, any effusion of blood, the conspirators were finally driven off. But, though beaten, these had not yet given up the contest. They retired beyond the bridge, and having intrenched themselves, began to insult the Catholics. Indignant, the latter rushed to the arsenal, brought a cannon to bear upon the Protestant intrenchment, and fired one shot, but without effect. Just as they were preparing to fire another, the venerable *avoyer* Wengi rushed, out of breath, before the cannon's mouth, and exclaimed: "Beloved and pious fellow-citizens, if you wish to fire against the other side, I will be your first victim; consider better the state of things."[3] His interposition was effectual; calm was restored; and the insurgents left the city.

We will conclude this paper, already long enough, by glancing rapidly at the war of Cappell in 1531, the first great religious war that ever was waged in Switzerland.[4] And we do this the more willingly, because it seems to us that there is a striking parallelism between this first and the last religious war to which we have already alluded. In both, the Catholics acted strictly on the defensive; in both, Lucerne was at the head of the Catholic party; in both, the genuine children of Tell proved themselves worthy of him, of their ancestral glory, of their country. There is, however, this important difference in the two wars, that whereas in the first the Catholics were triumphant, in the last, after having performed prodigies of valor, they were finally overwhelmed by main force.

In the beginning of the year 1531, the Protestant cantons, and especially Zurich, flagrantly violated the treaty concluded in 1529, by which the Catholic and Protestant cantons had mutually promised not to molest or interfere with one another on account of religion. After having fomented troubles in various districts partly under the control of the Catholic cantons, Zurich at length openly invaded the territory of St. Gall, and issued a decree forbidding the five neighboring Catholic cantons to trade with her subjects in corn and salt. The object of this embargo was, to cut off from the Catholic mountaineers the supplies which they had been in the habit of deriving by commerce from those living in the plains, and thereby *to starve* them into acquiescence in the glorious work of the reformation! Zuingle and the preachers openly clamored for the blood of the Catholics, in their public harangues in Zurich. Here is an extract from one of the great Swiss reformer's sermons, delivered on the 21st September, 1531:

---

[1] De Haller, pp. 72, 150 note, 156, 272, &c.

[2] P. 157.

[3] P. 159.

[4] There had been some troubles in 1529, which were, however, settled without much effusion of blood.

> "Rise up, attack; the five cantons are in your power. I will march at the head of your ranks, and the nearest to the enemy. Then you will feel the power of God, for when I shall harangue them with the truth of the word of God, and shall say: whom seek you, O ye impious! then, seized with terror and with panic, they will not be able to answer, but they will fall back, and will take to flight, like the Jews on the mountain of Olives at the word of Christ. You will see that the artillery which they will direct against us, will turn against themselves, and will destroy them. Their pikes, their halberds, and their other arms, shall not hurt you, but will hurt them."[1]

This discourse was printed and circulated; but alas for the prophetic faculty of the reformer! The event falsified his prediction in every particular. And, as Zuingle himself marked the preparations the five cantons were making for the coming struggle, even his own heart failed him; and the lately inspired prophet of God dwindled down into a miserable poltroon, overcome by terror, and pretending to have had strange presentiments, and observed strange signs in the heavens! Nevertheless, the Zurichers compelled him to march at their head to the village of Cappel, near the confines of the hostile cantons.

Here the two armies encountered; but fiery and fanatical as were the Zuinglians, they could not withstand the impetuous charge of the brave Swiss mountaineers. These carried everything before them. The Zurichers took to flight in great disorder, with the loss of "nineteen cannon, four stands of colors, all their baggage, and of at least fifteen hundred men, among whom were twenty-seven magistrates, and FIFTEEN PREACHERS."[2] Zuingle, the apostle of Switzerland, fell, sword in hand, fighting the battles of the Lord, as never apostle had fought them before!

The Zurichers, however, recovered from their fright in a few days, and on the 21st of October,[3] "having been reinforced by their allies of Saint Gall, of Toggenburg, of Thurgovia, and even of the Grisons, of Berne, of Bâle, and of Soleure, they again attacked the Catholics with very superior forces; but they were a second time defeated at the mountain of Zug, and took to flight in disorder, abandoning their artillery, their money, and their baggage."[4]

---

[1] Quoted by de Haller, pp. 78, 79, note.

[2] Ibid, pp. 79, 80.

[3] The battle of Cappell was fought on the 11th of October.

[4] P 81.

The Catholic army now marched in triumph almost to the very walls of Zurich, after having a third time defeated the Zurichers, and driven them from their position.[1] The Zuinglians, thus humbled by defeat, were now disposed to accede to the terms of peace proposed by the Catholic cantons. The treaty bound the Zurichers "to leave the five cantons, with their allies and adherents, from the present to all future time, in peaceable possession of *their ancient, true, and undoubted Christian faith,* without molesting or importuning them with disputes or chicanery, and renouncing all evil intentions, stratagems, and finesse; and that, on their side, the five cantons would leave the Zurichers and their adherents free in their belief; that in the common districts, of which the cantons were co-sovereigns, the parishes which had embraced the new faith, might retain it if it suited them, that those which had not yet renounced the ancient faith would also be free to retain it, and that, in fine, those who should wish to return to the *true and ancient Christian faith* would have the right to do so."[2] The Zurichers farther bound themselves to pay or rather to restore to the five cantons, the money which the latter had expended in the difficulties of 1529; and to replace, at their own expense, the ornaments destroyed or forcibly taken from the different churches during the preceding years.

Thus terminated the war of Cappell. It left the Catholics in the ascendant, and contributed more than anything else to check the headlong progress of the Swiss reformation.

---

[1] Page. 83.

[2] Page. 85.

XIII. PRESCOTT'S CONQUEST OF MEXICO.*

ARTICLE I.

CHARACTER OF THE CONQUERORS.

Prescott as an historian—Compared with other American writers—His style and manner—Qualities essential to an historian—Prescott's research—His authorities—His accuracy—His impartiality—His religious prejudices—The ghost of the Inquisition haunts him—His gross charges against the Catholic Church—His enthusiasm awakened—Romantic character of the conquest—Rapid sketch of its history—Character of the conquerors—Hernando Cortes—Compared with ancient generals—Was the conquest justifiable?—Principles and facts bearing on this question—Horrid human sacrifices among the Aztecs—The Spaniards and the Puritans compared—Were the conquerors wantonly cruel?—Facts and specifications alleged and explained—Palliating circumstances—Seizure of Montezuma—And execution of Guatamozin—Prescott's testimony—Spanish conquest of Mexico and English conquest of India compared—Cortes and Lord Clive—Macaulay.

THE History of the Conquest of Mexico is truly a splendid work on a splendid subject. Much as we expected from the accomplished historian of the magnificent reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, our expectations have not been disappointed in the present work. It not only fully sustains, but it even elevates the character of Mr. Prescott as an historian. We view his second as far superior to his first production, both in matter and manner; and we have not a doubt, that if he persevere in the career upon which he has so happily entered, he will rank ere long among the very first, if not as the first, of our writers, and will stand very high even in proud and jealous England.

The style of the present work is chaste, polished, dramatic; and it compares favorably with that of any American writer with whom we are acquainted, not excepting even the exquisite Washington Irving. It combines something of the chaste smoothness and delicate taste of Irving, with the liveliness of Paulding and Stephens; while it is, to a great extent, free from the carelessness and occasional bad taste of the two last, and of Cooper; and it is far superior, in every respect, to that of the inflated and transcendental Bancroft. The constant sweetness of Irving cloys. After perusing one of his works, you feel as if you had spent a day in a rich flower garden, laid off with exquisite taste, and filled with the choicest plants: you are delighted with every thing; you behold nothing to find fault with, but, in the evening, your head is wearied, and it aches with the excessive fragrance.

***History of the Conquest of Mexico, with a Preliminary View of the Ancient Mexican Civilization, and the Life of the Conqueror, Hernando Cortez.* By William H. Prescott. Author of the History of Ferdinand and Isabella. In 3 vols. 8 vo. pp. 488, 480, 524 Harper & Brothers, New York, 1843.

The atmosphere in which Mr. Prescott moves is less aromatic, but is, perhaps for this, all the purer and more refreshing. His Conquest of Mexico loses little by comparison with the Life of Columbus and Astoria, perhaps the best historical works of Irving,—productions which do not appear to come under the remark just made. In other respects, however, Prescott falls greatly below Irving,—in modesty, in good humor, in freedom from undue prejudice.

Still it would be exaggerated eulogy to say that Mr. Prescott's style is wholly faultless. The severe critic will perhaps find it too stiff and labored in the introduction, and occasionally too tame or careless in the body of the work. The former evidently smells of the lamp; in it the writer appears ill at ease; he treads the stage clad in the buskin and uniform. In the latter he descends, puts on a graceful deshabille, and intermingles carelessly in the stirring scenes of life. And as far as style is concerned, we are free to acknowledge, that we greatly prefer too much carelessness to too great rigidity.

The introduction, comprising two hundred pages on the Aztec civilization, is one of the most highly wrought and elaborate essays we have ever read. This, together with another essay in the appendix to the third volume, on the origin of the Aztec civilization, the author assures us, "cost him as much labor, and nearly as much time, as the remainder of the history."[1] The inquiry into the origin of the Aztec civilization furnishes a very learned, though somewhat skeptical, view of the various theories of antiquaries, for explaining what Mr. Prescott calls, "the riddle of the Sphinx, which no Œdipus has yet had the ingenuity to solve."[2] And the result of his labors proves that he himself is no Œdipus: he reaches a conclusion which strongly reminds us of that of Johnson's Rasselas, "in which nothing is concluded."[3]

The introduction embodies, in a highly condensed form, whatever Clavigero, Sahagun, Torquemada, Boturini, Veytia, Camargo, Ixtlilxochitl,[4] Baron Humboldt, Lord Kingsborough, and other learned antiquaries had written on the interesting subject of the Aztec civilization. From it we gather, that however advanced the nations of Anahuac might have been in civilization, they were still in a very rude and and savage condition. Their ignorance of the metals, and of the use of domestic beasts of burden; their imperfect and cumbrous picture-writing; their mean and crouching subserviency to the will of a despot; and above all, their brutish cannibalism, and their loathsome human sacrifices, all contributed to sink them very low in the scale of civilization. From their semi-civilized, or rather wholly barbaric condition, even Voltaire could not contrive to make out a plausible argument, or even a sneer, against Christianity.

It appears to us that Mr. Prescott's *forte* lies in description. Many of his descriptions, whether of scenery, of battles, or of natural phenomena, are peculiarly dramatic: some of them have the vividness of pictures. We might furnish many examples of this from the History of the Conquest. But we have much to say on a theme so ample and inviting, and our limits are very contracted. Hence we must reluctantly confine ourselves to those passages which will naturally come up in the train of our remarks; and we can barely allude to the following additional ones which struck us forcibly, viz: the graphic description of a storm which broke over Mexico on the night of the Conquest;[1] the vivid account of the storming of the great temple by Cortez and his veterans;[2] and the lively manner in which are painted the dreadful horrors of the *Noche Triste*.[3]

---

[1] Pref. p. x. [2] Prescott iii, 376. [3] Cf. Ibid. iii, 418.

[4] The Mexican name of a distinguished Indian writer—the lord of Tezcuco. Those who are startled at this euphonious name, may try whether they can pronounce, at a breath, the following specimens of Mexican diction: *Nottazomahuizteopixcatatzin*, the name of a priest; or this name of a messenger, *Amatlacuilolitquitcatlaxtlahuitli*! ! See Prescott, iii, 395 *note*.

But style, however important, is not everything in an historian. It is to him what drapery is to a statue. To ascertain the real merit of the work, we should examine the proportions and symmetry of the figure itself, its fidelity as a representation of the original, and the amount of artistic skill displayed in its formation. Research, accuracy, and impartiality, are three essential qualities of a good historian.

Without the first, he were wholly unqualified for the task; he would be like an artist without suitable materials and tools. Without the second, all research, however laborious, would be thrown away; and the historian would resemble the statuary, who, with polished instruments and beautiful marble, should still, through carelessness or want of genius, execute but a wretched piece. Finally, without the third, all previous research, as well as the sincere wish to be accurate, would generally prove unavailing: the historian would perhaps unconsciously miscolor or misstate facts. His work would resemble that of a painter who, though not deficient in labor, mechanical skill, and exactness, should yet spoil his piece with misplaced or excessive coloring.

Does Mr. Prescott possess these three qualities essential to an historian? We would be much pleased to be able to answer, without exception or reservation, in the affirmative: we are really partial to the man, who, besides being a fellow-countryman, exhibits himself in his writings the easy and polished gentleman. We feel no disposition to do him the least injustice; and deeply do we regret that a love of truth compels us to give different answers in regard to these different characteristics of the historian.

His laborious research is unquestionable. He has thoroughly examined, and seems to have carefully sifted all the original authorities in relation to the Conquest. To obtain the necessary documents, many of which were in manuscript, he spared no labor nor expense. The great facilities which his previous researches had already afforded him, while he was preparing the History of Ferdinand and Isabella, were still farther increased by the kindness and liberality of many of the leading Spanish *literati* of the day. He was allowed free access to the valuable papers collected with great labor and care by Don Juan Baptista Muñoz, the indefatigable royal historiographer of the Indies; as well as to those of

---

[1] Prescott, iii, 208, *et seq.*

[2] Ibid. ii, 384, *et. seq.*

[3] Ibid. ii, 361, *et. seq*

Don Vargas Ponce, the late president of the royal academy of history at Madrid. The present liberal president of this academy, the learned and accomplished Don Martin Fernandes de Navarette, also permitted the free use of his numerous manuscripts.[1]

From these ample collections, the accumulation of half a century, he obtained no less than eight thousand pages of unpublished documents.[2] He was also greatly aided in his task by men of distinguished learning in Mexico; among whom he names with gratitude Count Cortina, Don Lucas Alaman, the minister of foreign affairs, and his friend, Don Angel Calderon de la Barca, late minister plenipotentiary of the court of Madrid to the Mexican republic, and subsequently to the United States.[3]

To these abundant sources of information, was added the liberal aid of several Italian scholars of eminence, among whom the most conspicuous was the duke of Monteleone, the heir and representative of Cortes, who freely communicated the family papers.[4] With all these facilities, Mr. Prescott was enabled to give to the world, we believe for the first time, the whole substance, and a partial translation of the famous fifth despatch or *Carta Quinta* of Cortes, detailing the startling events of his dreadful march through Chiapa to Honduras.[5]

Most of the original historians of the Conquest, as well as those who composed the earliest and best accounts of it from the original authorities, were either Spaniards or Mexicans. To the former class — by far the most numerous and important — belong the terse and vigorous Cortes himself, the sympathetic, enthusiastic and exaggerating Las Casas, the faithful Torquemada, the profound antiquary Sahagun, the concise and elegant Gomara, the pious and learned Toribio, the classical Herrera, the judicious Zurita, the brilliant though more recent De Solis, and last, not least, that charming old gossipping chronicler, Bernal Diaz, himself one of the Conquerors. To the latter belong the accomplished and elaborate Father Clavigero, a native of Vera Cruz; the learned and diffuse Ixtlilxochitl, the lord of Tezcuco; Muñoz Camargo, the historian of Tlascala; and the later Antonio Mariano, Veytia, Gama, and Archbishop Lorenzana.[6]

To these authors we may add Boturini, a learned antiquary, who, though an Italian by birth, yet wrote in Spanish. And be it borne in mind, that the most ancient and famous of all these writers — Sahagun, Torquemada, Gomara, Las Casas, Toribio, and Clavigero — were all Catholic priests. But for their labors and patient researches, in fact, our accounts of the Conquest would have been meagre indeed.

All these early historians our author seems to have thoroughly studied and examined. Appropriate references to them fill the margin of his pages. He furnishes chapter and verse for every important statement; and where the original authors disagree, he seems fairly to canvass their respective weight and arguments. We are delighted with this: there is some satisfaction in reading an author who thus proves himself fully acquainted with his subject. No one who has carefully perused the history of the Conquest can deny to the accomplished writer the praise of ample research.

---

[1] Pref. pp. vi, vii. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid. viii

[5] Volume iii. p. 279, *et seq.* and Appendix, No. XIV.

[6] Mr. Prescott furnishes us with excellent and well written sketches of all these distinguished writers: and this is perhaps one of the greatest merits of his book.

His general accuracy seems equally unquestionable. Whenever his judgment is not unduly biassed, he does substantial justice both to the subject, and to the character of the Conquerors. He manifests in general a charming moderation, and he furnishes his readers with the arguments on both sides of the more important questions which arise. Perhaps he even carries this apparent fairness too far: he occasionally falls into the error of the modern eclectic school of history, which makes it fashionable to support both sides of an historical argument with so much plausibility, as almost to bewilder the understanding, and to leave the real position of the historian a complete puzzle.[1]

But the most important question is: was he really impartial? Did he approach the subject with a mind free from all undue bias? Was there no lurking prejudice to cause obliquity of view? In other words, would he have drawn precisely the same picture of the Conquerors, had they not been Roman Catholics? Has he, in one word, redeemed the pledge given by himself in his preface? —

> "I have endeavored not only to present a picture true in itself, but to place it in its proper light, and to put the spectator in a proper point of view for seeing it to the best advantage. I have endeavored at the expense of some repetition to surround him with the spirit of the times, and, in a word, to make him, if I may so express myself, a cotemporary of the sixteenth century. Whether, and how far, I have succeeded in this, he must determine."

Availing ourselves of the privilege thus extended to us, as one of his readers, we regret to have to express the deliberate conviction, that he has not "succeeded" in accomplishing, to the full, what he "endeavored" to do, with so much apparent honesty of purpose. More than once religious prejudice has betrayed him into grievous error, as well as into gross injustice to the Conquerors. And we say it the more freely, as it is almost the only stain on an otherwise faultless book,— a dark spot, or rather a collection of spots on the sun,— which, however, it requires no telescope to discover. We regret this fault the more, as such prejudice is wholly unworthy the enlightened and moderate mind of Mr. Prescott; and it will add nothing to his posthumous fame.

What particular set of religious opinions he entertains, or whether he entertain any, we have no means of ascertaining. From some passages in his work, we would infer that his religious tenets sit very lightly on him.

---

[1] We have detected a few inaccuracies, not, however, of much moment. We will mention one. In a note (vol. i, p. 230), he alleges this testimony of a Spanish writer: "Cortes came into the world the same day that that infernal beast, the false heretic, Luther, went out of it," and he concludes from it, that, according to this writer, Cortes was born in 1483. Now this is the date, not of Luther's "going out of the world," which happened in 1546, but of his "coming into it." There is an error *somewhere*.

But one thing is certain: his prejudices against every person and thing Catholic flow in a strong and turbid current, which bears him along on its foamy waters, and overwhelms at times his otherwise clear intellect. We will furnish a few out of many proofs of this, to show how much fairness and impartiality we may expect, even from the polished Mr. Prescott, whenever our religious principles are involved. These specifications will further enable the impartial to judge, with how many grains of allowance many of his statements concerning the essentially religious character of the Conquest and of the Conquerors are to be received.

He seems to be terribly haunted by the ghost of the defunct Spanish Inquisition. Its "raw head and bloody bones" must have been an almost hourly apparition to him, while engaged in preparing his work; and we have no doubt that he was often startled, amidst his historical researches, by suddenly observing its fiery eye-balls fiercely glaring at him through the keyhole of his study! Foully has he been dealt with, and grossly misled, by that miscreant traitor and apostate, Llorente.[1] It is really deplorable, that a man of Mr. Prescott's liberal and enlightened mind should have permitted his credulity to be thus sported with by such a wretch.

That this language is not too severe, will be manifest from the following extracts from the History of the Conquest. Speaking of the horrible human sacrifices enjoined by the Aztec religion, he says:

> "Thus we find the same religion inculcating lessons of pure philanthropy on the one hand, and of merciless extermination, as we shall soon see, on the other. The inconsistency will not appear incredible to those who are familiar with the history of the Roman Catholic Church in the early ages of the inquisition."[1]

According to him the Aztec priests, preparing their victims for the dreadful sacrifice and gloating over their excruciating tortures, were but the inquisitors, or as he says in another place, the "Dominicans" of the new world!

> "It should be remarked, however, that such tortures were not the spontaneous suggestions of cruelty, as with the North American Indians; but were all religiously prescribed in the Aztec ritual, and doubtless were often inflicted with the same compunctious visitings which a devout familiar of the holy office might at times experience in executing its stern decrees."[2]

In the course of his History, he drags in this odious comparison by the heels, *usque ad nauseam;* and he even seems greatly to prefer the human sacrifices of the Aztecs to those made by the inquisition! Thus, to reconcile his exaggerated theory of the Aztec civilization with the practice of human sacrifices in Anahuac, he says:

> One may, perhaps, better understand the anomaly, by reflecting on the condition of some of the most polished countries in Europe, in the sixteenth century, after the establishment of the modern inquisition; an institution which yearly destroyed its thousands, by a death more painful than the

---

[1] The character of this man has been already exhibited, in our paper on the Spanish Inquisition.

[2] Vol i, p. 71. [3] Ibid. p. 77.

> Aztec sacrifices: which armed brother against brother, and setting its burning seal upon the lip, did more to stay the march of improvement than any other scheme ever devised by human cunning. . . The inquisition, on the other hand, branded its victims with infamy in this world, and consigned them to everlasting perdition in the next. One detestable feature of the Aztec superstition, however, sunk it far below the Christian. This was its cannibalism," &c.[1]

In another place he generalizes this loud declamation against the Spanish inquisition by unequivocally ascribing the alleged cruelties of that tribunal to the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Mark the spirit which breathes in the following sweeping assertion, to establish the truth of which he refers his readers, in a note, to his History of Ferdinand and Isabella:

> "But it should be remembered that religious infidelity at this period, and till a much later, was regarded—no matter whether founded on ignorance or education, whether hereditary or acquired, heretical or pagan — as a sin to be punished with fire and faggot in this world, and eternal suffering in the next. This doctrine, monstrous as it is, was the creed of the Romish (!), in other words, of the Christian Church, — the basis of the inquisition, and of those other species of religious persecution, which have stained the annals, at one time or other, of nearly every nation in Christendom."[2]

Such assertions deserve no comment, except that of just indignation or pity, that one who should have known better, has thought proper thus to travel out of his way, and to abandon the legitimate province of history, in order foully to asperse the religious principles of the oldest and most numerous body of Christians on the face of the earth,—of a body which was alone for fifteen hundred years in its championship of Christianity,—of a body, without whose advocacy of Christian principles, and guardianship of the Bible, Mr. Prescott himself would not, in all probability, have at this day the little religion with which he is blessed. What had the Spanish inquisition to do with a history of the Spanish conquest?

But the inquisition apart, what right had he deliberately to charge on the Catholic Church the practice and advocacy of idolatry? Was this, too, necessary to the integrity of his History? It is true he advances this accusation with some qualification and apparent misgiving; yet he advances it plainly enough. Speaking of the use, by Catholics, of "material representations of divinity,"—which, by the way, are not half so common among Catholics, as he would seem to imagine,—he says:

> "It is true, such representations are used by him (the Catholic) only as incentives, not as the objects of worship. But this distinction is lost on the savage, who finds such forms of adoration too analogous to his own to impose any great violence on his feelings. It is only required of him to transfer his homage from the image of Quetzalcoatl, the benevolent deity who walked among men, to that of the Virgin or Redeemer; from the cross which he has worshiped as the emblem of the god of rain, to the same cross, the symbol of salvation."[3]

The bigotry of this passage is only surpassed by its absurdity. Is the

---

[1] Ibid. pp. 83, 84.

[2] Vol. II, p. 30.

[3] Vol. I, pp. 291, 292.

Virgin, is the cross a divinity? Or was either ever held as such by any Catholic that ever breathed? And so the poor savages could not be taught the distinction between stocks and stones, and the Divinity "who dwelleth in light inaccessible!"

It would seem, in fact, that, Mr. Prescott's natural acuteness wholly abandons him, whenever he enters on the hallowed ground of religious discussion. Once he has set his foot within the sanctuary, he plays all mannner of fantastic tricks, among which casting somersets — self-contradiction — is perhaps the most conspicuous.[1] Take the following passage as a specimen of this:

> "It was not difficult to pass from the fasts and festivals of the one religion (the Aztec), to the fasts and festivals of the other (the Christian); to transfer their homage from the fantastic idols of their own creation, to the beautiful forms in sculpture and in painting, which decorated the Christian cathedral. It is true, they could have comprehended little of the dogmas of their new faith, and little, it may be, of its vital spirit. But if the philosopher may smile at the reflection, that conversion, under these circumstances, was one of form rather than of substance, the philanthropist will console himself by considering how much the cause of humanity and good morals must have gained by the substitution of these UNSULLIED rites, for the brutal abominations of the Aztecs."[2]

If Mr. Prescott's picture of the conversion of the Aztecs be faithful, —which it is not,— the philosopher, one would think, should rather weep than smile over its sad want of reality. If, however, he belong to the school of Democritus, rather than of Heraclitus, and have smiles to throw away, he might bestow one of the merriest on Mr. Prescott himself, for his singular consistency in styling *unsullied* those rites which he had just before said were sullied with the grossest and most stupid idolatry!

But the most singular instance of the bigotry of Mr. Prescott against every thing Catholic is yet to come. Who would ever have thought that the Spanish renegade and apostate, the notable and *veracious* Blanco White, — whose apostasy was so amply remunerated, if it was not purchased by British gold,— was a competent authority for reference in the history of the Conquest? Yet it is even so. Mr. Prescott — the smooth and refined Mr. Prescott — actually alleges his authority, in a note, to confirm or illustrate the following precious *morceau* in the text:

> "But the doctrines (of Catholic Christianity) were too abstruse to be comprehended at a glance by the rude intellect of a barbarian. And Montezuma may have, perhaps, thought it was not more monstrous to feed on the flesh of a fellow-creature, than *on that of the Creator himself.*"(!)[3]

The shocking grossness of this passage, is equaled only by its glaring impiety, bordering on blasphemy, and by the lamentable ignorance it displays. It is worthy of those carnal-minded Jews of Capharnaum, who asked: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?"[1] And so revolting is it, in fact, that it has drawn down upon the author's head a severe and well merited rebuke from one of the leading American Reviews.[2]

---

[1] Mr. Prescott does not seem to admit the soundness of Petit Jean's wise maxim in the "Plaideurs" of Racine: "O dame! On ne court pas deux lievres a la fois!" In the historic chase he often starts and follows two or more hares at once! Hence his blunders and inconsistencies.

[2] Vol. iii, pp. 267, 268.

[3] Vol. ii, pp. 88, and *note*.

We might present many more extracts breathing a similar spirit; but what we have already furnished will suffice for the present, and the subject may recur in the sequel. We would ask whether Mr. Prescott, with all those gross and bitter prejudices, could have entered cordially into the feelings, and given proper explanations of the motives and conduct of men whose religion he so cordially hated? Like Diogenes, trampling with his muddy feet the costly carpets of Plato, he rebukes, with still greater bigotry,[3] the imputed bigotry of the Spaniards. Yet we will do him the justice to say that he has honestly "endeavored" to paint correctly the Spanish Conquest, as well as the noble heroism of the men who accomplished it. And, considering his deep religious prejudices, he has succeeded much better in this than could have been anticipated.

Perhaps, in composing his history, he had also an eye to business, and cast a shrewd glance at the religious atmosphere breathed by those for whom it was written. Perhaps, too, he may have been under the impression that he could not hope to reach the Elysium of popular favor, without first casting some crusts to the many-headed Cerberus of religious prejudice! Many a modern writer thinks himself compelled to pay this unworthy tribute in passing — shall we be allowed the comparison, made with all due respect to old Charon and to printers' devils? — the Styx of the press. When will this unworthy trembling before the slightest breath of the *aura popularis* cease? When will authors of respectability be free from a thraldom as galling as it is degrading? Will the Moloch of religious bigotry continue to prove more insatiable than was even the war-god of the Aztecs, fed on human victims?

But, as we have already intimated, in spite of the religious prejudice which so strongly swayed the bosom of Mr. Prescott, the greatness and magnificence of his theme inspired him and carried him away. Cold and puritanical as his soul may have been, it could not resist the torrent of enthusiasm which bore away the Conquerors on its bosom, any more than could the warlike Aztecs resist their strong arms, their good swords, and their iron will. Hence he kindles with his subject, enters heartily into its stirring scenes and startling adventures, shares in the sufferings and triumphs of the Conquerors, and, bating some gross insults to the religion which they prized more dearly than life, appreciates their lofty motives, and does them ample justice.

The annals of mankind, though they unfold many scenes which show "how thin is the partition that divides romance from reality," yet tell of few such feats as the Conquest of Mexico by the Spaniards. As our historian well remarks: "The whole story has the air of fable rather than of history; a legend of romance — a tale of the genii."[1] He thus happily groups together the principal startling incidents of which it is made up, when viewed merely as a military achievement:—

---

[1] St. John vi, 53.

[2] The Democratic Review, Feb'ry, 1844. Article on "Prescott's Conquest of Mexico."

[3] The incident here alluded to is well known. Diogenes, soiling with his muddy feet the carpets of Plato, observed with a sneer: "*Calco fastum Platonis.*" Plato calmly replied; "*At majore fastu!*"

> "That a handful of adventurers, indifferently armed and equipped, should have landed on the shores of a powerful empire, inhabited by a fierce and warlike race, and, in defiance of the reiterated prohibitions of its sovereign, have forced their way into the interior; — that they should have done this, without knowledge of the language and the land, without chart or compass to guide them, without any idea of the difficulties they were to encounter, totally uncertain whether the next step might bring them on a hostile nation or on a desert, feeling their way along in the dark, as it were; — that, though nearly overwhelmed by their first encounter with the inhabitants, they should still have pressed on to the capital of the empire, and, having reached it, thrown themselves unhesitatingly into the midst of their enemies; — that, so far from being daunted by the extraordinary spectacle there exhibited of power and civilization, they should have been but the more confirmed in their original design; — that they should have seized the monarch, have executed his ministers before the eyes of his subjects, and, when driven forth with ruin from the gates, have gathered their scattered wreck together, and, after a system of operations, pursued with consummate policy and daring, have succeeded in overturning the capital, and establishing their sway over the country; that all this should have been effected by a mere handful of indigent adventurers, is a fact little short of the miraculous,— too startling for the probabilities demanded by fiction, and without a parallel in the pages of history."[2]

The number of Spaniards, who marched the first time against Mexico, fell short of four hundred.[3] Accompanying the expedition there were about six thousand Tlascalans, and a few Cempoallans; and the whole force did not exceed seven thousand men, who were to fight against and to conquer the countless myriads of Montezuma. The Spaniards were compelled to fight their way to the capital inch by inch; and they had first to subdue, before they could avail themselves of the services of, the intervening warlike tribes. Among these, the most formidable were the fierce mountaineers — "the Swiss of Anahuac," as Mr. Prescott styles them, or rather the Spartans,— the brave and independent Tlascalans; first the most deadly enemies, and then the most steadfast friends of the Conquerors.

With this mere handful of ill-assorted troops, the Spaniards had to encounter, in his own capital, the dread Montezuma, a name terrible throughout Anahuac — a name which could summon in an instant millions of fierce warriors, prepared to do battle to the death under his banner! They had to plant their standard in the very heart of Tenochtitlan,— "the Venice of the Aztecs;" they had to uphold it there, against the myriads who, lashed into a wild fury by the battle cry of their great war-god, rushed to the onslaught, and made almost superhuman efforts to pull it down. Cut off from all communication with the main land, by the surrounding lakes and the opened sluices of the dykes,— hemmed in by the hosts who were fiercely shouting for their blood, and clamoring for new human victims for their terrible Moloch,—exhausted with fatigue, reeking with wounds, and almost expiring with hunger;—they yet maintained with desperate bravery the unequal contest.

---

[1] Vol. iii, p. 215.

[2] Ibid., pp. 221, 222.

[3] Vol. ii, p. 60.

Driven from the capital amid the unutterable horrors of the *Noche Triste*, they gathered together the miserable wreck of their former army; and, after fighting their way back to the coast, contending at every step with hunger, with thirst, with snares laid for their destruction, with hostile armies sent out to cut off their retreat, doomed to destruction, though "fated not to die;" they again, in nothing dismayed by their past sufferings, fought their way back to the capital, unmindful of danger, and regardless of the awful death on the fatal stone of sacrifice;—a doom which stared them in the face, and which had already fallen to the lot of many among their comrades.

Montezuma was no more; but a greater than Montezuma now sat on the imperial throne of the Aztecs. Young, active, persevering, fertile in resources, and determined rather to die with his people than to submit to the Spanish yoke, Guatamozin—the last of the Aztecs—was prepared to defend his capital to the last extremity; and his people, to a man, shared in the determination of their youthful sovereign. The superstitious awe which had seized them on the first appearance of the Spaniards, had now yielded to a deadly hatred of men, whose past reverses had proved them equally mortal with themselves. Now came the deadly strife, the fierce tug of war.

The result is known, and the story is soon told. After feats of daring and bravery which only Spanish chivalry could achieve,—after a siege, perhaps the most memorable in the annals of history,—after a series of desperate assaults, and equally desperate defenses, almost without a parallel,—the iron purpose of the Spaniards won the day, and the banner of Castile floated in triumph from the loftiest pinnacle of the great temple of Tenochtitlan. But it floated over a city laid in ruins, and reeking with the blood of the slain. The Aztecs would have it so: they had fiercely resisted every offer of capitulation; they had determined to bury themselves under the ruins of their capital! Thus fell the proud "Venice of the Aztecs." But two years had elapsed since the Spaniards began their first march to Mexico, and already they had subdued an immense empire.

However the hearts of the Conquerors may have bled over the ruined palaces and fallen turrets of the capital; however they may have sympathized with the appalling sufferings of its people, yet the iron fate of war left them no alternative. The Conquest, through the desperate resistance of the Aztecs, could have been effected with no less disastrous results. The city, however, rose speedily from its ruins; the Spaniards soon made it more beautiful and magnificent than ever, and they substituted the Christian church for the odious and blood-stained *Teocalli;* the cross for the gory statue of the war-god; and the pure and unbloody sacrifice of Christianity for the horrible human sacrifices of the Aztec superstition.

Thus, by almost supernatural exertions and sacrifices, was a vast barbaric empire subdued, and reclaimed to Christian civilization.

The actors in the stirring scenes of this great drama were men of iron nerve and chivalrous daring. They all achieved feats of almost superhuman strength, and won imperishable laurels in this contest. From the common soldier, old Bernal Diaz,— who, to hear his own account, was one of the prime movers in every leading enterprise,— up to the great Captain himself, all distinguished themselves by a perseverance and a patient endurance of toil and suffering, which would have done honor to the Spartans of Leonidas, or to the legions of Cæsar.

Among the leaders, there was Gonzalo de Sandoval, the brilliant, the bold, the daring, the successful, the darling of the army and of his general, the soul of chivalry,— the Tancred of the expedition. There was the equally brave, though less amiable and scrupulous Alvarado, the future conqueror of Guatemala, the *Tonatiuh*, or "child of the sun," of the Aztecs,— the Bohemond of the Conquest. But peering far above them all, a pyramid of strength, stands forth the colossal character of Hernando Cortes,— the Godfrey de Bouillon of the Conquest. He was the very man for the emergency. He was the body as well as the soul of the enterprise: it was *his* work, in its inception, in its progress, in its termination. *His* genius originated it, created the means by which it might be accomplished, not only overcame, but turned to account, the seemingly insuperable obstacles which interposed, watched over it in every trying stage of its progress, and finally brought it to a glorious consummation. Few men, whether in ancient or modern times, ever contended with more difficulties, endured more hardships, were more fertile in expedients, or triumphed with means so slender and inadequate.

Once he had landed in Mexico, and conceived the idea of conquering the empire, he burnt his fleet; thus cutting off all hope of retreat, and leaving his men no alternative but to conquer or to die. He then buckled on his good sword, and with his little army followed fearlessly the banner of the Cross, which he had resolved to plant on the loftiest pinnacle of the city of Montezuma. On, on, with the battle cry of "God and St. Iago!" No dangers appal, no difficulties discourage him. Labor, and toil, and hardships, and reverses, are his daily bread: his soul rises with obstacles, as the ship rises with the waves. A child of fortune, he seems to rise superior to fortune; or rather, his genius transmutes misfortunes into brilliant success.

When, after incredible toil and hazard, he has the golden prize already in his grasp, and reposes quietly in the capital of Montezuma, he learns that Narvaez had been sent with a formidable force to supersede him in the command. Not a moment is lost. He marches with electric rapidity to meet his rival, surprises him in his camp, defeats his fresh and regular troops with one-fourth of their number, and, almost without a struggle, takes them prisoners, wins their affections, incorporates them with his own army, and thereby doubles his own effective force. He finds that he cannot hope to take the capital, without a fleet to command the surrounding lakes; and his genius creates a fleet, and has it transported across the mountains on the shoulders of his men.

Olid, a subordinate chieftain rebels: Cortes leaves all his Mexican laurels behind him, and to chastise him, marches three thousand miles through the unexplored wilderness of Chiapa,— through wood and marsh, over lake and river; making every obstacle bend to his iron will, checking the rising disaffection of his troops, reviving their drooping spirits, himself leading the way in every toil and hardship: nor does he give over the seemingly hopeless enterprise, but boldly pushes on, till he has attained his object. Perhaps, in all the annals of mankind, there is not to be found a parallel to this dreadful march to Honduras. It cost the great Conqueror nearly as much time, and perhaps more hardship and danger, than the Conquest of the Mexican empire itself.

In one word, Cortes was ready to undertake anything and everything; and he seldom failed to accomplish whatever he undertook. He had the intuition of genius; his mind took in at a glance all the incidents and bearings of an enterprise, no matter how difficult or complicated it might appear.[1]

We know of no exact parallel to his character, but he possessed traits in common with many great generals of antiquity. He moved and conquered with the electric rapidity of Pyrrhus, but he was more successful: he subdued a more warlike empire than Alexander, but he did not, like him, subsequently waste his energies in debauch: he had the courage, skill, and indomitable energy of Scipio Africanus, and, like him, he destroyed a great capital; — but, unlike Scipio, he caused this capital to rise again from its ashes more splendid than ever. He conquered with Cæsar, and with him, "he wrote his own commentaries,"[2] almost amidst the stirring scenes of the battle-field itself. He had the iron nerve and the fertile invention of Hannibal, and the same unconquerable energy in encountering difficulties; but he was much more fortunate than Hannibal. And it is remarkable that old Bernal Diaz compares him to the two generals last named:

> "He preferred to be called 'Cortes' by us, to being called by any title; and with good reason, for the name of Cortes is as famous in our day, as was that of Cæsar among the Romans, or of Hannibal among the Carthagenians."[3]

We regret that our limits will not allow of copious extracts from the History of the Conquest, setting forth the character of Cortes, to which Mr. Prescott does as ample justice as his religious prejudices would possibly permit. We can make room for but one or two:

"Indeed, the history of the Conquest, as I have already had occasion to remark, is necessarily that of Cortes, who is, if I may so say, not merely the soul, but the body of the enterprise,—present everywhere in person, in the thick of the fight, or in the building of the works, with his sword or with his musket, sometimes leading his soldiers, and sometimes directing his little navy. The negotiations, intrigues, correspondence, are all conducted by him; and, like Cæsar, he wrote his own commentaries in the heat of the stirring scenes which form the subject of them."[1]

---

[1] Old Bernal Diaz makes the following *naive* and pious reflection on the exploits of the Conquerors: "and, as I ponder on *our* exploits, I feel that it was not of ourselves that we performed them, but that it was the providence of God which guided us. Much food is there here for meditation!" — *Ap. Presc.* ii, 178.

[2] Cf. Prescott, iii, 352.

[3] Apud eundem, iii, 356.

"He was a knight errant in the literal sense of the word. Of all the band of adventurous cavaliers, whom Spain, in the sixteenth century, sent forth on the career of discovery and conquest, there was none more deeply filled with the spirit of romantic enterprise than Hernando Cortes. Dangers and difficulties, instead of deterring, seemed to have a charm in his eyes. They were necessary to rouse him to a full consciousness of his powers. He grappled with them, at the outset, and, if I may so express myself, seemed to prefer to take his enterprises by the most difficult side! He conceived, at the first moment of his landing in Mexico, (*doubtful*) the design of its conquest. When he saw the strength of its civilization, he was not turned from his purpose. When he was assailed by the superior force of Narvaez, he still persisted in it; and, when he was driven in ruin from the capital, he still cherished his original idea. How successfully he carried it into execution, we have seen. After the few years of repose which succeeded the Conquest, his adventurous spirit impelled him to that dreary march across the marshes of Chiapa; and, after another interval, to seek his fortunes on the stormy Californian gulf. When he found that no other continent remained for him to conquer, he made serious proposals to the emperor to equip a fleet at his own expense, with which he would sail to the Moluccas, and subdue the spice islands for the crown of Castile!"[2]

A convincing proof of the great interest which attaches to the personal history of Cortes, and an evidence, too, of the skill of Mr. Prescott as a historian, is found in the fact, that his work loses none of its attractiveness, after the description of the final siege and fall of Mexico. The brilliant De Solis had closed his History of the Conquest with this last scene of the great drama; but Mr. Prescott, at the hazard of not sustaining his narrative, continues it after this event, and unfolds the various startling vicissitudes in the subsequent career of Cortes. And never was a biography more interesting, both in itself and in the manner in which it is treated. Few readers who have gone as far as the fall of Mexico, will refuse to accompany the author to the close of his volume; and many even will read with pleasure the valuable papers in the Appendix.

We cannot close this notice without attempting briefly to answer two questions, which have been often asked respecting the Conquest of Mexico:

1. Was the Conquest justifiable?

2. Was it stained with unnecessary and wanton cruelty by the Spanish Conquerors?

1. The principles by which we judge, in the abstract, of the right of conquest, are very abstruse and difficult to be ascertained with certainty. They lie back in the very foundations of society, and constitute the most delicate and difficult portions of international jurisprudence. Conquerors

---

[1] Ibid. 352.

[2] Ibid. 353, 354.

seldom reason; they act. They come up to Sheil's definition of an Irishman: "they act first, and think afterwards." *Might* and *right* are not synonymous terms; but they have been too often viewed as such in the annals of conquest. We recollect once to have read on the barrel of a cannon the significant inscription: ULTIMA RATIO REGUM, — the last reason of kings. This saying is perhaps still more true of conquerors than of kings.

The right of conquest involves a number of very complicated questions; and the slightest circumstance may change a whole case. Hence, perhaps, the best method of deciding the question, whether the Spanish Conquest was justifiable, will be to present a succinct statement of the facts bearing on the case, with such reflections interspersed, as the facts may themselves suggest or warrant. We will adopt this method, and will state nothing which is not undoubted, and for which we will not have the authority of Mr. Prescott himself; though we shall be compelled to controvert some of his positions. And, unless we are greatly mistaken, it will clearly appear from the train of our remarks, that, if ever a conquest was justifiable, that of Mexico by the Spaniards was so.

Before the expedition of Cortes, the enterprise of the Spaniards had already discovered the continent bordering on the gulf of Mexico, and it had been visited by two other adventurers, Cordova and Grijalva:

> "Under this chivalrous spirit of enterprise, the progress of discovery had extended, by the beginning of Charles the Fifth's reign, from the bay of Honduras, along the winding shores of Darien, and the South American continent, to the Rio de la Plata. The mighty barrier of the isthmus had been climbed, and the Pacific descried by Nuñez de Balboa; second only to Columbus in this valiant band of 'ocean chivalry.'"[1]

Grijalva had not returned; but Cordova had, by his glowing accounts, quickened the zeal, and stimulated the enterprise of Velasquez, the governor of Cuba. The latter accordingly fitted out an expedition, at the head of which he placed Hernando Cortes. The objects of this enterprise were: to find Grijalva; to rescue six Christians whom Cordova had reported as lingering in captivity in Yucatan; and lastly and chiefly, to extend the Spanish commerce with the natives. In the instructions given to Cortes, no allusion is made to a conquest of the country, properly so called:

> "But the great object of the expedition was barter with the natives. In pursuing this, special care was to be taken that they should receive no wrong, but be treated with kindness and humanity. Cortes was to bear in mind, above all things, that the object which the Spanish monarch had most at heart was the conversion of the Indians. He was to impress on them the grandeur and goodness of his royal master, to invite them 'to give in their allegiance to him, and to manifest it by regaling him with such comfortable presents of gold, pearls and precious stones, as, by showing their own good will, would secure his favor and protection.' He was to make an accurate survey of the coast, sounding its bays and inlets for the benefit of future navigators. He was to acquaint himself with the natural products of the country,"[2] &c.

---

[1] Vol. i, p. 217.

[2] Ibid. 248—9.

The author adds, that the general tenor of the instructions given to Cortes "must be admitted to provide for the interests of science and humanity, as well as for those which had reference only to a commercial speculation."[1]

Armed with these humane and pacific instructions, Cortes landed in Mexico; nor did he violate either the spirit or the letter of them, until compelled to do so by the indomitable hostility of the Indians. They, and not he, struck the first blow; and his appeal to arms was a necessary measure of self-defense. The first battle occurred at Tobasco; and Mr. Prescott speaks of the conduct of Cortes as follows:

> "Before commencing hostilities, that 'he might act with entire regard to justice, and in obedience to the instructions of the royal council,' he first caused proclamation to be made through the interpreter, that he desired only a free passage for his men; and that he proposed to revive the friendly relations which had formerly subsisted between his countrymen and the natives. He assured them that if blood were spilt, the sin would lie on their heads and that resistance would be useless, since he was resolved at all hazards to take up his quarters that night in the town of Tobasco."[2]

This proclamation was received by the Indians, "with shouts of defiance and a shower of arrows."[3] This was a usual mode of procedure with Cortes, who was, *in no instance,* the aggressor;—at least on his first march to Mexico, and until he had been hopelessly committed in the war of the Conquest. Thus, ere he encountered the fierce Tlascalans,

> "Cortes, when he had come within hearing, ordered the interpreter to proclaim that he had no hostile intentions, but wished to be allowed a passage through their country, which he had entered as a friend. This declaration he commanded the royal notary, Godey, to record on the spot, that if blood were shed it might not be charged on the Spaniards."[4]

At Cempoalla, the capital of the Totonacs, he had already heard of the tyranny of Montezuma, and of the horrid human sacrifices practiced by the Aztecs. The Cempoallan cazique had told him, that Montezuma was "a stern prince, merciless in his exactions, and, in case of resistance, or any offense, sure to wreak his vengeance by carrying off their young men and maidens to be sacrificed to his deities. Cortes assured him, that he would never consent to such enormities; he had been sent by his sovereign to redress abuses and to punish the oppressor; and if the Totanacs would be true to him, he would enable them to throw off the detested yoke of the Aztecs."[5] He had already assured the cazique "that he had come to the Aztec shores to abolish the inhuman worship which prevailed there, and to introduce the knowledge of the true God."[6]

The more nearly the Spaniards approached the capital, the more were their souls harrowed by the spectacles which everywhere met their eyes, revealing both the execrable tyranny of Montezuma, and the awful extent to which was carried the practice of human sacrifices among the Aztecs. In one place—called *Cocotlan* by Bernal Diaz—"there were thirteen *teo callis* (temples); . . . and in the suburbs they had seen a receptacle, in which, according to Bernal Diaz, were stored a hundred thousand skulls of human victims, all piled and ranged in order! He reports the number as ascertained by counting them himself."[1] The author adds: "The Spaniards were destined to become familiar with this appalling spectacle as they approached nearer to the Aztec capital."[2]

---

[1] Vol. i, p. 248-9.

[2] Ibid. p. 278

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid. p. 426.

[5] Ibid. p. 346.

[6] Ibid. p. 445.

These human sacrifices, of which many among the Spaniards themselves were destined subsequently to become the victims,[3] had been long carried to a frightful extent in Anahuac. It was an essential part of the Aztec religion, and was yearly on the increase. On this subject Mr. Prescott says:

> "The amount of victims immolated on its accursed altars would stagger the faith of the least scrupulous believer. Scarcely any author pretends to estimate the yearly sacrifice throughout the empire at less than twenty thousand, and some carry the number as high as fifty. On great occasions, as the coronation of a king, or the consecration of a temple, the number becomes still more appalling. At the dedication of the great temple of Huitzilopotchli, in 1486, the prisoners, who for some years had been reserved for the purpose, were drawn from all quarters of the capital. They were ranged in files, forming a procession nearly two miles long. The ceremony consumed several days, and seventy thousand captives are said to have perished at the shrine of this terrible deity!"[4]
>
> "One fact may be considered certain. It was customary to preserve the skulls of the sacrificed, in buildings appropriated to the purpose. The companions of Cortes counted one hundred and thirty-six thousand in one of these edifices. . . . Indeed the great object of war with the Aztecs was quite as much to gather victims for their sacrifices, as to extend their empire. Hence it was that an enemy was never slain in battle, if there were a chance to take him alive. To this circumstance the Spaniards repeatedly owed their own preservation. When Montezuma was asked, 'why he had suffered the republic of Tlascala to maintain her independence on his borders,' he replied, 'that she might furnish him with victims for his gods.'"[5]

Such then was the tyranny, and such were the horrible abominations prevalent among the Aztecs! Could the Spaniards, could Cortes look on those scenes unmoved? Could ~~he, as a Spanish chevalier of lofty~~ bearing, leave all those wrongs unredressed? Could he resist the cry of the fettered slave who implored his aid in breaking his bonds, and asserting his freedom from an odious tyranny which was crushing him in the dust? Could he, as a knight of the cross, suffer the temples any longer to be besmeared with human gore, or the smoke of the horrid sacrifice any longer to ascend from wreaking human victims? Could he, when he had the power to prevent it, permit the most sacred laws of society and of humanity to be thus openly and frightfully trampled on, under his very eyes? Could he, in one word, as a true knight, sworn to redress grievances, to protect the weak, and to assert the right, do otherwise than he actually did?

---

[1] Ibid. p. 399.

[2] Ibid. pp. 399—400.

[3] See Prescott, volume iii, pp. 152—3, for a graphic description of the dreadful sacrifice of the Spaniards on the summit of the great *teocalli* of Mexico.

[4] Introduction, pp. 79, 80.

[5] Ibid. pp. 81—2. For a lively picture of the manner in which the revolting sacrifice was performed, see ibid. p. 75, *et. seq.* For the appalling spectacle which met the eyes of the Conquerors when they first visited the Aztec temples of Mexico, see Vol. ii, p. 152. Old Bernal Diaz testifies that those "hells" smelled more strongly than the worst charnel houses of Castile.

He had come to Mexico with pacific intentions; he had not been the aggressor; he was drawn into the war against his own will; by circumstances beyond his control, he was subsequently hurried into it more and more deeply: at every step of his progress, he saw new grievances to redress, new abominations to suppress; the oppressed nations of Anahuac loudly called on him for protection against an inhuman despot, who was grinding them down with exactions, and snatching away, for the horrid sacrifice, their sons and their daughters: in the midst of all these stirring scenes, the hearts of both himself and his companions in arms, beat high with the chivalrous feelings which had lingered longer in Spain than in any other country: — could he, we repeat it, under all these circumstances, have acted otherwise than he did?

Was he, in the first moment of danger, through an over-nice point of honor, or a too delicate sense of the Aztec rights, to turn his back on men, who themselves respected the rights of neither God nor man; — insulting the former with human sacrifices, and trampling systematically on the the dearest rights of the latter? Had he thus ingloriously fled, he would not have been a true Castilian chevalier, nor a faithful knight of the cross. But Providence had entrusted to him a higher mission, and well and truly did he fulfill it. Wherever his arms were victorious, the fetters of the crouching slave were stricken off, and the trembling captive, reserved for the sacrifice, escaped from his horrid cage.[1] Whithersoever he went, he was the protector of the weak, and the scourge of the oppressor. Nor did he desist, until the throne of the haughty Aztec was laid low; until his temples were purified from the abominations of human victims, and dedicated to the true God in a purer worship.

According to the principles of natural reason, and the authority of Montesquieu, Grotius, Puffendorf, and most writers on international law, human sacrifices alone, generally practised among a people, would justify their subjugation by another, in case they would not consent, on being properly appealed to, to abolish of themselves the abominable custom. If war may be lawfully declared for the flagrant violations of the rights of property, is it not, *a fortiori*, lawful, when it is waged to protect from the most barbarous death hundreds of thousands of human beings? If by the universally received principles of international law, war may be declared to abolish the slave trade, can it not, *a fortiori*, be declared for the object just referred to? Mr. Prescott, in fact, does not dissent from these views, however he may seek to conceal or to qualify his opinion. Take this passage as an evidence; he is speaking of the Aztec sacrifices:

> "Men became familiar with scenes of horror and the most loathsome abominations. Women and children — the whole nation became familiar with, and assisted at them. The heart was hardened, the manners were made ferocious, the feeble light of civilization, transmitted from a milder

---

[1] Cf. Prescott, vol. ii, p. 83.

race, was growing fainter and fainter, as thousands and thousands of miserable victims, throughout the empire were yearly fattened in its cages, sacrificed on its altars, dressed and served at its banquets! The whole land was converted into a vast human shambles! The empire of the Aztecs did not fall before its time!"[1]

Then follows this singular passage:

"Whether these unparalleled outrages furnish a sufficient plea to the Spaniards for their invasion, whether with the Protestant, we are content to find a reward for it in the natural rights and demands of civilization, or, with the Roman Catholic, in the good pleasure of the Pope (!)—on the one or the other of which grounds, the conquests by most Christian nations in the east and west have been defended—it is unnecessary to discuss, as it has already been considered in a former chapter."[2]

One would have thought, had not Mr. Prescott intimated the contrary, that Protestants had not monopolized all the common sense of the world; and that Roman Catholics could claim an equal right with them to defend their conquests by an appeal "to the natural rights and demands of civilization." We boldly deny the truth of the assertion, that any Catholic power ever rested the defense of its conquests, "in the good pleasure of the Pope;" and the authorities to which Mr. Prescott refers for proof of this, "in a former chapter," do not establish it, any more than a long note appended to the present one, establishes the immaculateness of the Puritans who colonized New England.

This will clearly appear from a very brief examination of Mr. Prescott's curious opinion, on the theory of the right of conquest as maintained by Catholics. After having asserted, without any sufficient evidence, that the holy See claimed a right to all pagan lands, he adds:

"Thus Alexander VI. generously granted a large portion of the western hemisphere to the Spaniards, and of the eastern to the Portuguese. These lofty pretensions of the successors of the humble fishermen of Galilee, far from being nominal, were acknowledged and appealed to as conclusive in controversies between nations."[3]

This last fact solves the whole problem. The Catholic powers of Europe, fearing to come into collision in the rapid progress of their discoveries, appealed, by mutual consent, to the common father of the faithful, as a freely chosen arbitrator, to mark out the limits of their prospective territories. The Popes, feeling that their powerful mediation might prevent war and bloodshed, as freely acceded to the proposal. The result proved their wisdom and forecast. The treaty of Tordesillas between the Spanish and Portuguese governments, proceeding on the basis of this papal partition, settled, without a drop of blood, a controversy which otherwise might have involved both governments in a dreadful war.[4]

That this is the true view of the whole matter, appears more clearly from Mr. Prescott's own admission—singularly inconsistent with his previous random assertions. He says:[5]

"It should be remarked that, whatever difference of opinion existed between the Roman Catholic — or rather the Spanish and Portuguese nations — and the rest of Europe, in relation to the true foundation of their titles in a moral view, they have *always* been content in their controversies with one another, to rest them *exclusively* on priority of discovery."

---

[1] Vol. iii, p. 117.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid. vol. ii, p. 31.
[4] Cf Prescott, ibid. *note*.
[5] Ibid p 32, *note*.

And in proof of this, he quotes Vattel and Chancellor Kent. Thus it is manifest, from our author's own showing, that his assertion concerning the Catholic nations resting their titles "in the good pleasure of the Pope," is all a fallacy, — a mere insipid crust thrown to the Cerberus of bigotry.

We have a word to bestow, by the way, on our old friends, the good Puritans of New England, whom Mr. Prescott draws into the discussion on the right of conquest. He admits "that King James' patent asserted rights as absolute nearly as those claimed by the Roman See."[1] But the Puritans of New England did not rest their claims on this patent — not they! Nor did they rest them on the general arguments alleged by other Protestants, drawn from the design of God that the soil of the earth should be extensively cultivated, or from the wants of an ever-expanding civilization. They were far too enlightened to maintain their titles under any such flimsy pretexts! "On the contrary," our author tells us, "they established their title to the soil by *fair* purchase of the aborigines; thus forming an honorable contrast to the policy pursued by too many of the settlers on the American continent."[2]

All that this fine picture needs is fidelity of outline, and truth of coloring. In bargaining, the aborigines of North America were no match for the shrewd Puritans; especially, as was often the case, after the heads of the former had been excited "by copious draughts of rum!" They often sold their territory for a mere trifle: sometimes, as in the case of the Pequods of Connecticut, their soil was seized on by reckless violence. The good Puritans were too often wont to treat them as Amalecites, who were to be driven without mercy from their new Chanaan.

If there be any truth in history, it is certain that the Puritans were in the habit of first cheating, then of goading into war, next of driving into the wilderness or selling into bondage, and lastly, if other means failed, of exterminating the poor Indian tribes of New England! The preachers often accompanied these expeditions of extermination, marching at the head of the troops, and with the "godly Stone," pouring forth long prayers for the success of their arms.[3]

Did Mr. Prescott forget that the Puritans exterminated or drove into the wilderness all the once flourishing tribes of New England — the Pokanokets, the Naragansetts, the Pequods? Did he forgot the treacherous manner in which they requited the generous hospitality of old Massasoit — who had first sheltered them in his wigwam — by selling the only heir of his house into bondage under the burning sand of Bermudas? Did he forget the long continued and cold blooded and systematic cruelty, with which they successively swept from the face of the earth most of the original occupants of the soil? Did he forget that they did little or nothing for their religious culture? Could he, a New Englander, have wholly forgotten all these things, to say nothing of the blue laws and the burning of witches? If he did not, why hold up his forefathers as such paragons of perfection, and models for imitation? The *fairness* of the Puritans, forsooth!

---

[1] Cf. Prescott, p. 82, *note*.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Cf. Bancroft *passim*. In our Review of Webster's Bunker Hill speech, (*infra*,) the subject will be discussed at length.

2. This naturally leads us to the second question: Did the Spaniards stain their Conquest of Mexico with wanton and unnecessary cruelty?

Mr. Prescott's own authority warrants us to answer emphatically in the negative. Our limits will not allow us to dwell at any great length on this question: nor is it necessary to do so. The subject will probably recur in our next article on Mr. Prescott's work, in which we mean to speak of the religious point of view of the Conquest; and besides, the case is a very plain one, and, though complicated in its details, is yet easily made out. Never was there, perhaps, in the whole history of mankind, a conquest which was effected with less bloodshed. Never was there one which was conducted with more moderation and discretion, even in the heat of the most stirring scenes. Never was there one stained with fewer crimes, or in which more effectual means were adopted to check violence and to stay cruelty.

All this can be easily established by incontestable evidence. We have already seen, how humane was the spirit breathed by the instructions furnished to Cortes by Velasquez. Mr. Prescott is our witness that Cortes faithfully kept those instructions, at least until he had reached Cholula, on his way to the Aztec capital:

> "The present expedition, up to the period of its history at which we are now arrived, had been probably stained with fewer of such acts (of violence,) than almost any similar enterprise of the Spanish discoverers in the new world. Throughout the campaign, Cortes had prohibited all wanton injuries to the natives, and had punished the perpetrators of them with exemplary severity. He had been faithful to his friends, and with perhaps a single exception, not unmerciful to his foes."[1]

What this single exception is, we are at a loss to guess, unless the historian refers to his having had the hands of the Tlascalan spies cut off, and his having sent them to their countrymen in this mutilated condition. But this severity, shocking as it may appear to our present delicacy, was really an act of mercy to the fierce Tlascalans, whose souls were thus stricken with a terror that induced them to close the war, and thereby to stop the effusion of blood: it was such even to the spies themselves, whom the international law of all nations would have consigned, and would even now consign, to the gallows. Was Washington inhumane, because he persisted in having Major André hung, though this brave man urgently entreated, as a last request, that he might be permitted to die the death of a soldier?

---

[1] Vol. ii, p. 23.

We do not mean to say that all the deeds of the Conquerors are defensible, or that they never perpetrated acts of cruelty unwarranted by the trying circumstances in which they were placed. But we do assert, that when all the circumstances are duly and impartially weighed, there was less of wanton cruelty than in any similar expedition for conquest recorded in history. The actions of men struggling to win an empire, and placed in daily and hourly peril of their lives, with treachery often lurking in their own camp, and snares encompassing them from without, are not surely to be judged by the rules of every day life. Rightly to appreciate them, we must divest ourselves of the present, transport ourselves back to their own times, and intermingle with them in all the stirring scenes of their great drama. Judging the Conquerors by this equitable standard, we will find that they were guilty of fewer acts of violence than many refined nations of even this *enlightened* age, placed under similar circumstances. The bloody deeds of the Conquerors almost disappear, when put in comparison with the cruelties perpetrated by the *enlightened* English at the storming of Badajoz,[1] and in other passages of the Peninsular war; to say nothing of the other multiplied horrors of the wars which lately desolated Europe.

The wanton cruelties, perpetrated by some of the Spanish commanders, were severely rebuked by Cortes. Thus the cold-blooded massacre of the Mexicans, ordered by Alvarado, in the absence of Cortes from the capital, was strongly censured by him on his return, however much Alvarado sought to justify it by motives of alarm and of expediency. Speaking of this incident, Mr. Prescott says:

> "When Alvarado had concluded his answers to the several interrogatories of Cortes, the brow of the latter darkened as he said to his lieutenant: 'You have done badly. You have been false to your trust. Your conduct has been that of a madman.' And, turning abruptly on his heel, he left him in undisguised displeasure."[2]

There is scarcely a deed of cruelty ascribed to the Spaniards, which had not its justifying, or at least its palliating circumstances. Thus the massacre at Cholula, ordered by Cortes, was viewed by him as a necessary measure of self-defense, under circumstances of imminent peril to the very existence of the Spaniards. They had entered the city as friends; they had been received as friends; they had conducted themselves as friends. While every external appearance indicated friendship on the part of the Cholulans, and promised security to their guests, a foul conspiracy was detected, which aimed at nothing less than the extermination of the whole Spanish army! Thus betrayed by men wearing the mask of friendship, Cortes determined to strike the first blow, as the only means his genius could suggest to avert the threatened destruction. And though, reposing in the security of our closet, we may be inclined to think that he exceeded the just measure of legitimate defense, yet the result justified his forecast.[3]

---

[1] Mr. Prescott admits this, vol ii, p. 34.

[2] Vol. ii, p. 289.

[3] Cf. Ibid. pp. 33-35.

Another matter of crimination against Cortes is the seizure of Montezuma in his own capital, while the emperor was regaling him and his army with princely hospitality. But fairness requires us to remember, that the truth and honesty of the Aztec emperor were strongly suspected; and that his previous conduct had rendered these suspicions doubly strong. The Spaniards too were in a most critical situation, in the midst of hostile myriads, who awaited only the beck of Montezuma to pounce on and destroy them; or lead them to the fatal stone of sacrifice. In this emergency, their only security lay in possessing themselves of the person of Montezuma, and in using his influence to subdue the city, without shedding a drop of blood. It was a bold step, worthy the genius and daring of Cortes; and, as a matter of expediency, and even, in a certain sense, of humanity, it was a master-stroke of policy. Mr. Prescott himself, though he follows the most unfavorable accounts of the transaction, yet pronounces this equitable opinion:

> "To view the matter differently, we must take the position of the Conquerors, and assume with them the original right of conquest. Regarded from this point of view, many difficulties vanish. If conquest was a duty, every thing necessary to effect it was right also. Right and expedient became convertible terms. And it can hardly be denied that the capture of the monarch was expedient, if the Spaniards would maintain their hold on the empire."[2]

It is scarcely pretended, that after his seizure, Montezuma was treated with wanton inhumanity by the Spaniards. Their treatment of the brave and patriotic Guatamozin, after the fall of Mexico, is not so easily defended. But if he was submitted to the torture, it is but justice to Cortes to say, that he opposed it with all his might, and only yielded to the clamor of his soldiers supported by the royal treasurer, Alderete.[3] The soldiers were flushed with victory, and goaded into madness by disappointment in not finding the expected booty, which, it was alleged, Guatamozin had concealed, they openly threatened insurrection: and it is difficult to say how far the influence even of Cortes could have checked or stayed their violence. Indeed, when we reflect with how motley and reckless a soldiery he had to deal, we are lost in amazement at the success of his efforts to enforce subordination, and to prevent deeds of wanton cruelty.

If Guatamozin was subsequently executed by Cortes, we should bear in mind, that the deed was done amidst the awful scenes of that dreadful march to Honduras: and we could pardon almost every thing to a man exhausted by so many hardships, and beset with so many dangers. Any one who will read attentively Mr. Prescott's account of the whole transaction, must come to the conclusion, that Cortes viewed it as a necessary measure of security to the *lives* of himself and followers. His Indian auxiliaries vastly outnumbered his own troops: amid those dreary marshes of Chiapa, the Spaniards were wholly in the power of their Aztec allies:

---

[1] Mr. Prescott admits as much. vol. ii, p. 159. [2] Vol ii, p. 176. [3] Cf. Prescott, iii, 236, *et seq.*

these threatened to pounce upon them in their exhausted condition, and to rear again the fallen banner of Guatamozin. A conspiracy for this purpose was organized, of which the fallen emperor was believed to be the ringleader. Under these trying circumstances, Cortes thought that he had no alternative.[1]

Finally, if much blood was shed, and many horrors enacted during the final siege and capture of Mexico, it was not so much the fault of the Spaniards, as of the circumstances of the siege itself. The Spaniards would fain have taken the capital without shedding a drop of blood; but the obstinate spirit of the Aztecs resisted all their repeated overtures for a capitulation. We cannot better vindicate the conduct of the Conquerors in this emergency, than in the language of Mr. Prescott:

> "Their swords were rarely stained with blood, unless it was indispensable to the success of their enterprise. Even in the last siege of the capital, the sufferings of the Aztecs, terrible as they were, do not imply any unusual cruelty in the victors: they were not greater than those inflicted on their own countrymen at home, in many a memorable instance, by the most polished nations, not merely of ancient times, but of our own. They were the inevitable consequences which follow from war, when, instead of being confined to its own legitimate field, it is brought home to the hearth-stone, to the peaceful community of the city,—its burghers untrained to arms, its women and children yet more defenseless. In the present instance, indeed, the sufferings of the besieged were in a great degree to be charged on themselves,—on their patriotic but desperate self-devotion. It was not the desire, as it was certainly not the interest, of the Spaniards to destroy the capital or its inhabitants. When any of these fell into their hands, they were kindly entertained, their wants supplied, and every means taken to infuse into them a spirit of conciliation; and this, too, it should be remembered, in spite of the dreadful doom to which they consigned their Christian captives. The gates of a fair capitulation were kept open, though unavailingly, to the last hour. The right of conquest necessarily implies that of using whatever force may be necessary for overcoming resistance to the assertion of that right. For the Spaniards to have done otherwise than they did, would have been to abandon the siege, and with it the conquest of the country. To have suffered the inhabitants, with their high-spirited monarch, to escape, would but have prolonged the miseries of war, by transferring it to another and more inaccessible quarter. They literally, as far as the success of the expedition was concerned, had no choice. If our indignation is struck with the amount of suffering in this, and in similar scenes of the Conquest, it should be borne in mind, that it is a natural result of the great masses of men engaged in the conflict."[2]

In conclusion, we would beg the impartial reader to compare for a moment the Spanish Conquest of Mexico with the English Conquest of India; and the Spanish Hernando Cortes with the English Lord Clive. How immaculate do even the darkest deeds of the Spanish Conquerors appear, when placed by the side of those done by the English of the eighteenth century in India? For drops of blood shed by the Spaniards, the English shed gallons; for tens on whom the Spaniards inflicted suffering, the English inflicted it on thousands. The horrors of the Spanish Conquest were transient; and they were speedily forgotten in the blessings of the new civilization of which the Conquerors were the harbingers: the horrors of the English Conquest still remain, increased a hundred fold; the tens of millions of enslaved and crushed victims, yet send forth their notes of wailing under English tyranny. The dreadful horrors recently enacted in Afghanistan and Schinde are but links in the chain of a systematic cruelty and oppression which has continued, with little intermission, since the first moment of the Conquest,—or for the last ninety years! Lastly, the Spaniards abolished the horrid human sacrifices of the Aztecs, and indoctrinated them in Christianity: the English bowed down the bodies, but cared little for the souls of their victims; and the horrid car of Juggernaut still crushes its hundreds of fanatical worshipers!

---

[1] Cf. Ibid, p. 285, *et seq.*

[2] Vol. iii, pp 218, 219.

And then, how does the character of Lord Clive compare, or rather contrast with that of Hernando Cortes! Bold, daring, gifted, and successful like Cortes, Clive had not a particle of his chivalry, nor of his moral principle. As a warrior, too, he was vastly inferior. He had not the same difficulties to contend with, nor the same fierce and warlike tribes to encounter. Though assisted with fire-arms, the soft and effeminate Bengalee was not to be put in comparison with the fierce Aztec, and the warlike Tlascalan. Finally, Cortes was an honorable and high-minded cavalier, whose lofty nature could not stoop to meanness; Clive was an intriguer, a hypocrite, a forger![1] The two names of Lord Clive and Hernando Cortes should not be breathed together, nor written on the same page, any more than those of Warren Hastings and the very worst of the Spanish viceroys that ever ruled in the Mexican capital.

---

[1] We would ask those, who may be disposed to think these epithets unwarrantable or too strong, to read Macaulay's review of "Malcolm's Life of Clive." We can present only the following brief extract: "Accordingly this man, in all the other parts of his life an honorable English gentleman and soldier, was no sooner matched against an Indian intriguer than he became himself an Indian intriguer, and descended without scruple to falsehood, to hypocritical caresses, to the substitution of documents, and to counterfeiting of hands!" Macaulay's Miscellanies, 8vo. p. 327. Carey & Hart, Philadelphia, 1843. Read the entire Review, as also the article on Warren Hastings, ibid, p. 460, et seq.

XIV. PRESCOTT'S CONQUEST OF MEXICO.

ARTICLE II.

THE RELIGIOUS POINT OF VIEW OF THE CONQUEST.*

Religious point of view necessary — Noble sentiment of Lope de Vega — Spaniards much influenced by it — Prescott's testimony — The Spanish cavalier, a soldier of the Cross — Injustice done his character by Prescott — The age of chivalry compared with the present — Motives which actuated Catholic and Protestant navigators and pioneers — A holy Crusade — Religious character of Cortes — His standard — Stirring address to his soldiers — The Cross unfurled — And animating the army — Zeal for the conversion of the natives — Religious rites and worship — Relative adaptation of Catholic and Protestant systems for making proselytes — Prescott's theory examined — Remarkable incidents showing the piety of the Conquerors — Their zeal sometimes too fiery — Catholic missionaries — They oppose cruelty to the natives — As well as all forced conversions — Las Casas and Olmedo — Alleged intemperate zeal of Cortes — Idols cast down — Explanation and defense — Charitable zeal of Olmedo — Aquilar and other missionaries — Religious ceremonies on launching the fleet — And at the termination of the siege — Missionaries after the Conquest — Destruction of the Teocallis — Great number of converts among the Aztecs — How accounted for — Prescott's theory — "The Aztec worship and Romish ritual!" — Alleged similarity between the two — Curious coincidences — Alleged miracles — Loss and gain to the Church — Conclusion.

In our first article, we endeavored to show what was the character of the Conquest and of the Conquerors of Mexico; and we examined how far Mr. Prescott has done justice to the subject. In the present paper, which will conclude our remarks on Mr. Prescott's work, we intend briefly to unfold the Religious Point of View of the Conquest, and to vindicate from the assaults of prejudice or ignorance the eminently religious character of the Conquerors.

Without examining the religious aspect of the Conquest, it were utterly impossible rightly to understand or properly to appreciate its character. Religion was, in fact, its great end and aim; its all-pervading motive; its very life and soul. Religion nerved the arms, stimulated the courage, and ennobled the chivalry of the Conquerors. Religion accompanied the Conquest in every eventful stage of its progress, softened down its manifold horrors, bound up and healed with a heavenly balm its many bleeding wounds; and soothed and raised up, by her sweet ministrations of mercy, the bruised hearts and crushed spirits of the vanquished. All this we hope to make appear, from unquestionable evidence.

One among the greatest of the Spanish poets, Lope de Vega, has in a single brief couplet unfolded the whole purpose of Hernando Cortes, and the great object of the Conquest which he achieved: —

---

* *History of the Conquest of Mexico, with a Preliminary View of the Ancient Mexican Civilization, and the Life of the Conqueror, Hernando Cortes.* By William H. Prescott, author of the History of Ferdinand and Isabella. In 3 vols. 8 vo., pp. 488, 480, 524 Harper & Brothers: New York, 1843.

"Al rey infinitas tierras,
Y a Dios infinitas almas."[1]

To extend the boundaries of the Spanish empire over the vast territories of the new world, and thereby to gain an infinite number of souls to God, was the twofold object of this and of every other Spanish Conquest. Mr. Prescott himself assures us, that this "is the light in which the Conquest was viewed by every devout Spaniard of the sixteenth century."[2] With the great French Catholic Champlain of North America, the "devout Spaniard" of that day deemed "the salvation of a soul more glorious than the conquest of an empire."[3] This heavenly motive of winning souls to God was much stronger in the mind and heart of the Spanish Catholic, than the earthly motive of mere worldly conquest. The former often prompted to the latter. The desire of planting the cross in the midst of heathen nations, and of thereby bringing them from "the region of the shadow of death," into the bright land of Christian civilization, generally preceded, it always accompanied the expedition for discovery and conquest. Upon this subject let us hear Mr. Prescott, whose testimony has additional weight, from the circumstance that it is extracted from that portion of his history in which he unfolds the strange theory of Catholic Conquest, to which we adverted in our first article:

> "With the right of conquest, thus conferred, came, also, the obligation, on which it may be said to have been founded, to retrieve the nations sitting in darkness from eternal perdition. This obligation was acknowledged by the best and the bravest, the gownsman in his closet, the missionary, and the warrior in the crusade. However much it may have been debased by temporal motives and mixed up with worldly considerations of ambition and avarice, it was still active in the mind of the Christian conqueror. We have seen how far paramount it was to every calculation of personal interest in the breast of Cortes."[4]

We have no doubt that our historian *sought* to do justice to the lofty religious chivalry of the Conquerors; and if he has not succeeded to the full, we are to ascribe the failure mainly to a deep and abiding prejudice — of which, perhaps, he himself was not wholly conscious — against the religion which they professed. There is, however, this extenuating circumstance in the bigotry of Mr. Prescott, that the evil generally carries with it its own remedy. Wherever this dark stain of prejudice is seen, sullying the whiteness and marring the beauty of his pages, there, by the side of it, you perceive also, the correctives of inconsistency, absurdity, and self-contradiction. It would really appear, that the enlightened and polished Mr. Prescott claims the right of being absurd and of contradicting himself, whenever he sets foot within the hallowed inclosure of the sanctuary. We have already given some instances of this amiable foible: and to show that we are not hazarding assertions, or bandying epithets at random, we will now proceed to point out some others, in connection with what we may call Mr. Prescott's religious theory of the Conquest.

---

[1] "To the King boundless territory, and to God innumerable souls."

[2] Vol. iii, p. 362 — *note*.

[3] See Bancroft, History U. States, vol. iii, chap. xx

[4] Vol ii, p. 31-2.

To soften down the charge of bigotry brought against Cortes, and to aid in estimating aright the true spirit of the Conquest, he offers the following remarks:

> "But this is unjust. We should throw ourselves back (it cannot be too often repeated) into the age; the age of the Crusades. For every Spanish cavalier, however sordid and selfish might be his private motives, felt himself to be the soldier of the cross. Many of them would have died in defense of it. Whoever has read the correspondence of Cortes, or, still more, has attended to the circumstances of his career, will hardly doubt that he would have been among the first to lay down his life for the faith. He more than once periled life, and fortune, and the success of his whole enterprise, by the premature and most impolitic manner in which he would have forced conversion on the natives."[1]

To these reasonable remarks he adds the following characteristic reflections:

> "To the more rational (!) spirit of the present day, enlightened by a purer (!) Christianity, it may seem difficult to reconcile gross deviations from morals with such devotion to the cause of religion. But the religion taught in that day was one of form and elaborate ceremony. In the punctilious attention to discipline, the spirit of Christianity was permitted to evaporate. The mind, occupied with forms, thinks little of substance."[2]

To us it appears wholly incomprehensible, how a religion of "mere form and elaborate ceremony," from which "the spirit of Christianity was permitted to evaporate," could have stimulated Cortes "to lay down his life for the faith!" Will Mr. Prescott say, that there was no "substance" in this "devotion to the cause of religion?" Is he of the opinion, that those of the present day, "enlightened by a purer Christianity," would be prepared to lay down their lives for its defense? Did his Puritan ancestors, basking in the rays of this "purer Christianity," covet, to any great extent, the crown of martyrdom?

In another place, our historian thus attempts to paint the character of the Spanish soldier of the cross:

> "The Spanish cavalier felt he had a higher mission to accomplish, as a soldier of the cross. However unauthorized or unrighteous the war into which he had entered may seem to us, to him it was a holy war. He was in arms against the infidel. Not to care for the soul of his benighted enemy was to put his own in jeopardy. The conversion of a single soul might cover a multitude of sins. It was not for morals that he was concerned, but *for the faith*. This, though understood in its most literal and limited sense, comprehended the whole scheme of Christian morality."[3]

It were difficult to reconcile together the assertions contained in the two last sentences; and to understand clearly how the Spanish cavalier "was not concerned for morals," while the faith, which glowed so warmly in his bosom, "comprehended the whole system of Christian morality!" If the accomplished author meant to assert — as seems probable — that the

---

[1] Vol. iii, p. 361. [2] Ibid., p. 362. [3] Vol. i, pp. 269, 270.

Spanish knight was not at all imbued with a knowledge of morality, and was taught by his Church to believe that faith alone could save him without works, then we enter our solemn protest against the assertion, which is little better than an injurious calumny.

As soldiers of the cross, the Spanish Conquerors were deeply imbued with that lofty and ardent spirit of chivalry, which had ever been a prominent trait in their national character. This spirit had grown up amidst the perils and adventures of that long protracted struggle of eight hundred years with the Moorish conquerors of Spain; whom, after many a deadly contest, the noble Spanish chivalry succeeded in finally driving from their beautiful country. It was a struggle for their homes, for their altars, for their liberties, for their very existence, against those who had fastened a foreign yoke of iron, together with a foreign fanaticism, on their necks. It was a struggle of the Cross against the Crescent; of Christian light and civilization against Mohammedan darkness and despotism. The Cross triumphed; and with its triumph were intimately blended all the most glowing reminiscences, and all the most glorious aspirations of Spanish patriotism. This historical view furnishes us with a key to the Spanish character, and explains to us its lofty bearing and its noble chivalry.

When, after the Conquest of Granada, the Moors were finally driven from Spain, Spanish chivalry panted for new fields of action on which it might win additional laurels; and the discovery of a new world, at this precise period, opened to its enterprise a new theater for adventure. Of the spirit with which the Spanish cavalier entered on this new career, Mr. Prescott speaks as follows:

> "The period which we are reviewing was still the age of chivalry; that stirring and adventurous age, of which we can form little conception in the present day of sober, practical reality. The Spaniard, with his nice point of honor, high romance, and proud, vain-glorious vaunt, was the true representation of that age. The Europeans, generally, had not yet learned to accommodate themselves to a life of literary toil, or to the drudgery of trade, or the patient tillage of the soil. They left these to the hooded inmate of the cloister, the humble burgher, and the miserable serf. Arms was the only profession worthy of gentle blood,— the only career which the high-mettled cavalier could tread with honor. The new world, with its strange and mysterious perils, afforded a noble theater for the exercise of his calling, and the Spaniard entered on it with all the enthusiasm of a palladin of romance."[1]

It is curious to mark the different spirit with which the various nations of Europe embarked on the new career of discovery and conquest, opened to them by the enterprising genius of Columbus and other Catholic navigators. Mr. Prescott makes the comparison in the following remarkable passage, which immediately follows that just given:

> "Other nations entered on it also, but with different motives. The French sent forth their missionaries to take up their dwelling among the heathen, who, in the good work of winning souls to Paradise, were content

---

[1] Vol. iii, p 64.

> to wear — nay, sometimes seemed to court — the crown of martyrdom. The Dutch, too, had their mission, but it was one of worldly lucre, and they found a recompense for toil and suffering in their gainful traffic with the natives. While our own Puritan fathers, with the true Anglo-Saxon spirit, left their pleasant homes across the waters, and pitched their tents in the howling wilderness, that they might enjoy the sweets of civil and religious freedom. But the Spaniard came over to the new world in the true spirit of a knight-errant, courting adventure, however perilous, wooing danger, as it would seem, for its own sake. With sword and lance, he was ever ready to do battle for the faith; and, as he raised his old war-cry of 'St. Jago,' he fancied himself fighting under the banner of the military apostle, and felt his single arm a match for more than a hundred infidels! It was the expiring age of chivalry; and Spain, romantic Spain, was the land where its light lingered longest above the horizon."[1]

The noble spirit, exalted motives, and devoted Christian zeal of the Catholic French and Spaniards, compare very advantageously, or rather contrast very strongly, with the sordid avarice and the mere carnal motives of the Protestant Dutch and Puritans, even if the latter did pant for "the sweets of civil and religious freedom;"—a fact more than questionable, when we consider their narrow-minded bigotry, their selfish and exclusive policy, and their bitter persecution of brother Protestants. Who would not greatly prefer to theirs, the noble type of the Spanish character, as exhibited in the elevated religious zeal, the heroic daring, and the generous self-devotedness of the soldier of the cross, in the new world? Who so dead to the feelings of chivalry, as not to be moved by the sight of a brave and devoted little band of cavaliers leaving home, and nobly battling for Christianity in a foreign land?

> "Feared by their breed, and famous by their birth;
> Renowned for their deeds, as far from home
> For Christian service, and true chivalry."[2]

Mr. Prescott tells us more than once, that the Conquest of Mexico was viewed by the Spaniards as a kind of holy crusade, for the extension of Christianity; and, though we think that he sometimes pushes this view of the subject too far, yet, in the main, it is correct. We cheerfully subscribe to the following declaration:

> "There can be no doubt, that Cortes, with every other man in his army, felt he was engaged in a holy crusade; and that, independently of personal considerations, he could not serve heaven better, than by planting the cross on the blood-stained towers of the heathen metropolis."[3]

The whole history of the Conquest proves this eminently religious character of Cortes and his associates, and establishes the fact that religious zeal was the distinctive feature and the all-pervading motive of the whole enterprise. Making proper allowance for his strong prejudice against the religion of the Conquerors, Mr. Prescott himself does justice to this branch of the subject: and in vindicating the motives and conduct of the Conquerors, we shall accordingly have little more to do than to allege his authority. The great number of facts we shall have to produce, as links in the chain of evidence, will allow us little room for comment; nor will much comment be necessary. We mean to show, that, throughout the eventful vicissitudes of the Conquest, the winning of souls to God was the all-absorbing consideration with the Spaniards, in comparison with which all others were undervalued; and that religion presided over the entire expedition, mitigating its evils, checking its excesses, and soothing its horrors.

---

[1] Vol. iii, pp. 61-5.

[2] Shakspeare. Richard II.

[3] Vol iii. p. 75.

Before Cortes and his army had set foot on the soil of Mexico, this noble purpose of converting the natives to Christianity, was strongly impressed on his mind, as the chief object of the expedition. In the instructions given him by Velasquez, the Governor of Cuba, he was told, as we have seen, "to bear in mind, above all things, that the object which the Spanish monarch had most at heart, was the conversion of the Indians; and to take the most *careful care*, to omit nothing that might redound to the service of God or his sovereign."[1]

Cortes determined to comply with the letter, while he entered fully into the spirit of these instructions. His banner was constructed in imitation of the famous *labarum*, which Constantine, the first Christian emperor, had made after the model of the cross he had seen in the heavens; and it was inscribed with a similar motto:

> "His principal standard, was of black velvet, embroidered with gold, and emblazoned with a red cross amidst flames of blue and white, with this motto in Latin beneath: 'Friends, let us follow the cross; and under this sign, if we have faith, we shall conquer.'"[2]

Ere he embarked on the expedition, Cortes addressed his heroic little band of intrepid adventurers in a strain well worthy the soldier of the cross:

> "You are few in number, but strong in resolution; and, if this does not falter, doubt not but that the Almighty, who has never deserted the Spaniard in his contest with the infidel, will shield you, though encompassed by a cloud of enemies; for your cause is a just cause, and you are to fight under the banner of the cross. Go forward, then, with alacrity and confidence, and carry to a glorious issue the work so auspiciously begun."[3]

This address was responded to with enthusiastic emotion by every man in that little army; while the blessing of God was solemnly invoked on the expedition ere it set sail:

> "Cortes was well satisfied to find his own enthusiasm so largely shared by his followers. Mass was then celebrated with the solemnities usual with the Spanish navigators, when entering on their voyages of discovery. The fleet was placed under the immediate protection of St. Peter, the patron saint of Cortes: and weighing anchor, took its departure on the eighteenth day of February, 1519, for the coast of Yucatan."[4]

Cortes knew of no argument better calculated to stimulate the courage and to awaken the ardor of his followers, than an appeal to their religious feelings. On the eve of his march to Mexico from Cempoalla,

> "The General spoke a few words of encouragement to his own men.

---

[1] Ibid., vol. i, pp 248–9. [2] Ibid. p. 258. [3] Ibid. pp. 263–4. [4] Ibid. p. 264.

He told them they were now to embark, in earnest, on an enterprise which had been the great object of their desires; and that the blessed Saviour would carry them victorious through every battle with their enemies. 'Indeed,' he added, 'this assurance must be our stay, for every other refuge is now cut off, but that afforded by the Providence of God, and your own stout hearts.' "[1]

Did the courage of his soldiers seem likely to falter, when they beheld themselves beset with difficulties and dangers in the heart of a country teeming with enemies? Did they hesitate, when, for instance, they were about to encounter the dreadful embattled array of the fierce and warlike Tlascalans? —

> "Cortes put himself at the head of his cavalry, and calling out, 'Forward, soldiers, the Holy Cross is our banner, and under that we shall conquer,' led his little army through the undefended passage; and in a few moments they trod the soil of the free republic of Tlascala."[2]

In the desperate battles which ensued on the soil of this fiery-hearted republic crowning the mountains of Anahuac, the banner of the cross, and the words of Cortes eloquently enforcing the motto inscribed thereon, led the Spanish army through apparently insuperable difficulties, and caused it to achieve prodigies of valor. In one of those sharp contests with the Tlascalans, when the chances for the Spaniards seemed desperate, as they beheld themselves overwhelmed by superior numbers:

> "Amidst the din of battle, the voice of Cortes was heard, cheering on his soldiers. 'If we fail now,' he cried, 'the cross of Christ can never be planted in the land. Forward, comrades! When was it ever known that a Castilian turned his back on a foe?' Animated by the words and heroic bearing of their General, the soldiers, with desperate efforts, at length succeeded in forcing a passage through the dark columns of the enemy, and emerged from the defile on the plain beyond."[3]

When, worn down with fatigue, and despairing of ever reaching Mexico, his soldiers entreated Cortes to retrace his steps, and to lead them back to the coast; "He made answer, 'we fight under the banner of the cross; God is stronger than nature;' and continued his march."[4] When his arms were crowned with success, he attributed the victory and all the glory to God's watchful Providence: "As we fought under the standard of the cross for the true faith, and the service of your highness," writes he in a despatch to Charles V., "Heaven crowned our arms with such success, that, while multitudes of the infidels were slain, little loss was suffered by the Castilians."[5]

Throughout the whole expedition, amidst all its stirring scenes and hair-breadth escapes, Cortes and his followers never forgot that they were knights of the cross, and that the chief object of the enterprise was the conversion of the natives. At Cozumel and at Tabasco; at Cempoalla and on the heights of Tlascala; in the holy city of Cholula and in the capital of Montezuma; in conferences with country casiques, with Aztec nobles, with Montezuma himself: amidst the overpowering fatigues of his march, when exhausted and worn down with hunger, watchfulness and incessant fighting; — at all times, and in all places, the object first in his thoughts, and first in his affections, the darling project of his soul, upon which he insisted, "in season and out of season," was the conversion of the natives to Christianity! This we could prove by a whole volume of evidence, drawn from the work of Mr. Prescott.

---

[1] Ibid. pp. 392–3.
[2] Ibid. p. 405.
[3] Ibid. p. 430.
[4] Ibid. p 456.
[5] Ibid.

The first point at which Cortes came in contact with the natives was the island of Cozumel; and our historian bears the following testimony as to his religious zeal on the occasion:

> "The first object of Cortes was to reclaim the natives from their gross idolatry, and to substitute a purer form of worship. . . There was nothing which the Spanish government had more earnestly at heart, than the conversion of the Indians. It forms the constant burden of their instructions, and gave to the military expeditions in this hemisphere the air of a crusade. The cavalier who embarked in them entered fully into these chivalrous and devotional feelings."[1]

A similar zeal for the conversion of the natives was manifested at Tabasco:

> "Before his departure the Spanish commander did not omit to provide for the great object of his expedition, the conversion of the natives. . . . He then caused the reverend fathers Olmedo and Diaz to enlighten their minds, as far as possible, on the great truths of revelation, urging them to receive these in place of their heathenish abominations. The Tabascans, whose perceptions were no doubt materially quickened by the discipline they had undergone, made but a faint resistance to either proposal. The next day was Palm Sunday, and the General resolved to celebrate their conversion by one of those pompous ceremonials of the Church, which should make a lasting impression on their minds. A solemn procession was formed of the whole army with the ecclesiastics at their head, each soldier bearing a palm-branch in his hand. The concourse was swelled by thousands of Indians of both sexes, who followed in curious astonishment at the spectacle. The long files bent their way through the flowering savannas that bordered the settlement, to the principal temple, where an altar was raised, and the image of the presiding deity was deposed, to make room for that of the Virgin with the infant Saviour. Mass was celebrated by father Olmedo, and the soldiers who were capable joined in the solemn chant. The natives listened in profound silence, and, if we may believe the chronicler of the event (Gomara) who witnessed it, were melted into tears; while their hearts were penetrated with reverential awe for the God of those terrible beings who seemed to wield in their own hands the thunder and the lightning."[2]

To account for the rapidity with which the natives were converted to Catholic Christianity, Mr. Prescott here speculates as follows on the relative adaptation of the Catholic and Protestant systems for making proselytes:

> "The Roman Catholic communion has, it must be admitted, some decided advantages over the Protestant, for the purposes of proselytism. The dazzling pomp of its service, and its touching appeal to the sensibilities, affect the imagination of the rude child of nature much more

---

[1] Vol. i, p. 269.

[2] Ibid. pp. 290–1.

powerfully than the cold abstractions of Protestantism, which, addressed to the reason, demand a degree of refinement and mental culture in the audience to comprehend them."[1]

In another place, speaking of the conversion of the Totonacs at Cempoalla, he farther unfolds his theory on the subject, as follows:

> "Mass was performed by father Olmedo, and the impressive character of the ceremony and the passionate eloquence of the good priest, touched the feelings of the motley audience, until Indians as well as Spaniards, if we may trust the chronicler, were melted into tears and audible sobs. The Protestant missionary seeks to enlighten the understanding of his convert by the pale light of reason. But the bolder Catholic, kindling the spirit by the splendor of the spectacle, sweeps along his hearers in a tempest of passion, that drowns every thing like reflection (!) He has secured his convert by the hold on his affections,—an easier and more powerful hold with the untutored savage, than reason."[2]

Honorable as is this testimony to the Catholic Church, coming from a prejudiced Protestant, yet we had, in our simplicity, entertained the belief that Protestantism, with "its cold abstractions," and "pale light of reason," had not monopolized all the intellect of the world; and that Catholic missionaries were also blessed with a small portion of reason wherewith "to enlighten the understanding of their converts." We may have been wrong; but unless we are greatly mistaken, Mr. Prescott himself shows, in many passages of his work—some of which we will hereafter furnish—that the Catholic missionaries, who accompanied the army of the Conquest, labored patiently to enlighten the understanding, no less than to move the hearts of their proselytes.

We will barely remark here, that our historian's theory, however much founded in truth it may appear to be in the main, does not adequately explain the notorious and undeniable fact, that *every* nation which has ever been converted to Christianity from paganism, and thereby reclaimed to civilization, has been converted by Catholic missionaries; and that, on the contrary, *no* nation has ever been thus converted by missionaries attached to the Protestant sects! For this remarkable result there must be some explanation, other than the mere diversity of means employed by the missionaries of the respective communions. There are such things as the special blessing of God on missionary toil, and a legitimate mission to undertake the work of conversion. Without these, all human philosophy were unavailing; for, "how can they preach unless they be sent?"[3] And there can be no doubt, that the almost total failure of Protestant missionary effort is ascribable at least as much to the want of these essential conditions, as to the employment of any inadequate or injudicious means for the conversion of heathens.

We might produce many other instances of the zeal which was everywhere manifested by the Conquerors for the conversion of the natives. But we must be satisfied with one more extract, merely referring our readers in the margin to many others[4] which we had marked for quotation, but which our narrow limits compel us to exclude. ' The author is speaking of the conference held by Cortes with the Aztec envoys of Montezuma in the Spanish encampment near Vera Cruz, previous to the commencement of the march to Mexico. The passage proves both the piety of the Conquerors and their zeal for converting the natives :

---

[1] Vol. i, pp. 290-1.

[2] Ibid. p. 361.

[3] Romans, ch. x.

[4] Cf. vol. i, pp. 325, 334, 396, 357, and vol. ii, pp. 55, 82, 87, 88, 150, 155, &c.

> "While they were conversing, the bell struck for Vespers(?).[1] At the sound, the soldiers, throwing themselves on their knees, offered up their orisons before the large wooden cross planted in the sands. As the Aztec chiefs gazed with curious surprise, Cortes thought it a favorable occasion to impress them with what he conceived to be a principal object of his visit to the country. Father Olmedo accordingly expounded, as briefly and clearly as he could, the great doctrines of Christianity, touching on the atonement, the passion, and the resurrection, and concluding with assuring his astonished audience, that it was their intention to extirpate the idolatrous practices of the nation, and to substitute the pure worship of the true God. He then put into their hands a little image of the Virgin with the infant Redeemer, requesting them to place it in their temples instead of their sanguinary deities."[2]

From the facts hitherto alleged, the impartial reader will have gathered what was the spirit, and what the zeal of the Conquerors for the diffusion of Christianity and the conversion of the Aztecs. If this zeal was at times too fiery and impetuous ; if it occasionally impelled the soldiers of the cross to think of appealing to their good swords, on the failure of milder means, for the suppression of an abominable and inhuman idolatry ; if they were sometimes betrayed into excesses which themselves would have condemned in their cooler moments ; we are not at all surprised at these occasional outbursts of intemperate zeal or passion. They are nothing more than might have been expected from the heat of a contest, fraught with so many difficulties and perils, pregnant with results so momentous, and so very stirring and exciting in its whole character. One thing is certain, from the testimony of Mr. Prescott himself, that the Catholic missionaries who accompanied the expedition used every effort to mitigate its horrors, and to suppress every species of violence. They were invariably the friends of the natives, whom they sought to protect from cruelty and oppression ; and they were likewise opposed to all forced conversions. We will establish both these facts by undeniable evidence.

In regard to the first — the prevention of cruelty to the natives — the following testimonies of our historian will speak for themselves :

> "The cruel system of *ripartimientos*, or distribution of the Indians as slaves among the Conquerors, had been suppressed by Isabella. Although subsequently countenanced by the government, it was under the most careful limitations. But it is impossible to license crime by halves — to authorize injustice at all, and hope to regulate the measure of it. The eloquent remonstrances of the Dominicans,— who devoted themselves to the good work of conversion in the new world with as much zeal as they showed for persecution (!) in the old,— but above all, those of Las Casas, induced the regent, Ximenes, to send out a commission with full powers

---

[1] More probably for the Angelus, or some other devotion. This gross ignorance of our religious practices is not unusual with Protestant writers.

[2] Vol. i, pp. 325-6.

to inquire into the alleged grievances, and to redress them. It had authority, moreover, to investigate the conduct of the civil officers, and to reform any abuses in their administration. This extraordinary commission consisted of three Hieronymite friars and an eminent jurist, all men of learning and unblemished piety. They conducted the inquiry in a very dispassionate manner; but, after long deliberation, came to a conclusion most unfavorable to the demands of Las Casas, who insisted on the entire freedom of the natives. This conclusion they justified on the grounds, that the Indians would not labor without compulsion, and that, unless they labored, they could not be brought into communication with the whites, nor be converted to Christianity. Whatever we may think of this argument, it was doubtless urged with sincerity by its advocates, whose conduct through their whole administration places their motives above suspicion. They accompanied it with many careful provisions for the protection of the natives."[1]

The excellent commissioners no doubt ascertained on the spot, that the statements of the good Las Casas in regard to cruelties practiced by the Spaniards towards the Indians, were greatly exaggerated. We can understand their decision on no other principle. Of father Olmedo, a man as great and as benevolent as Las Casas, and much more judicious, Mr. Prescott speaks as follows:

"The latter of these godly men (father Bartolomé de Olmedo) afforded a rare example — rare in any age — of the union of fervent zeal with charity; while he beautifully illustrated in his own conduct the precepts which he taught. He remained with the army through the whole expedition, and by his wise and benevolent counsels was often enabled to mitigate the cruelties of the Conquerors, and to turn aside the edge of the sword from the unfortunate natives."[2]

It is a standing charge against the Conquerors, that they forced conversion on the Mexicans. This assertion is not founded on fact. True it is, that Cortes and his soldiers, in the ardor of their zeal for the conversion of the natives, sometimes overstepped the bounds of discretion; but it is equally true, that this excessive ardor was checked and restrained by the missionaries accompanying the expedition, who were entirely opposed to all forced conversions. The indiscretion of Cortes, besides being only occasional, consisted rather in too hastily removing the abominable idol-worship of the Aztecs, than in compelling them to embrace Christianity. At any rate there is not *one* solitary instance on record of a forced conversion sanctioned by the Catholic missionaries. These were ever in favor of mildness, and patient instruction of the Indians. All this can be easily established on the authority of Mr. Prescott himself.

The first example of the alleged intemperate zeal of Cortes, is exhibited in his having caused the hideous idols of Cozumel to be hurled headlong from the summit of the *Teocalli*. It was a bold and daring stroke, in justification of which there were, however, many palliating circumstances. The good people of Cozumel, on being appealed to by the missionaries to cast away their idols, "exclaimed that these were the gods who sent them the sunshine and the storm, and, should any violence be offered, they would be sure to avenge it, by sending their lightnings on the heads of the perpetrators."[1] The sequel is thus finely related by Mr. Prescott:

---

[1] Vol. i, pp. 218, 219.

[2] Ibid. p. 271. See also vol. iii, p. 346.

> "Cortes was probably not much of a polemic. At all events he preferred on the present occasion action to argument; and thought that the best way to convince the Indians of their error was to prove the falsehood of the prediction. He accordingly, without further ceremony, caused the venerated images to be rolled down the stairs of the great temple, amidst the groans and lamentations of the natives. An altar was hastily constructed, an image of the Virgin and Child placed over it, and Mass was performed by Father Olmedo and his reverend companion for the first time within the walls of a temple in New Spain. The patient ministers tried once more to pour the light of the gospel into the benighted minds of the islanders, and to expound the mysteries of the Catholic faith. . . . They at length found favor with their auditors, who, whether overawed by the bold bearing of the invaders, or convinced of the impotence of deities that could not shield their own shrines from violation, now consented to embrace Christianity."[2]

Something similar occurred at Cempoalla, the capital of the Totonacs: and in both cases the forecast of the great Cortes was justified by the event, — the conversion of the natives. The old Cempoallan cazique, on being urged by the Spaniards to cast down his blood-stained idols, had shuddered at the thought, and had

> "Covered his face with his hands, exclaiming, 'that the gods would avenge their own wrongs.' The Christians were not slow in availing themselves of his tacit acquiescence. Fifty soldiers, at a signal from their General, sprang up the great stairway of the temple, entered the building on the summit, the walls of which were *black with human gore*, tore the large wooden idols from their foundations, and dragged them to the edge of the terrace. . . . With great alacrity they rolled the colossal monsters down the steps of the pyramid, amidst the triumphant shouts of their own companions, and the groans and lamentations of the natives. They then consummated the whole by burning them in the presence of the assembled multitude. The same effect followed as at Cozumel. The Totonacs, finding their deities incapable of preventing or even punishing this profanation of their shrines, conceived a mean opinion of their power compared with that of the mysterious and formidable strangers," &c.[3]

We have furnished these two examples of the alleged attempt by the Spaniards to force conversion on the natives, because they are the principal, certainly the strongest instances of the kind on record. But will not the candid reader admit, that the hideous rites and loathsome human sacrifices so common among the Aztecs, greatly palliated, if they did not wholly excuse, these strong measures? Did not the event prove, that this was the most effectual means for bringing about the permanent conversion of the natives? Who, for example, would blame the English government, should it, even by forcible means, prevent the hideous car of Juggernaut from annually crushing its stated number of victims? Or rather, who that has a soul and loves Christianity does not execrate the selfish policy of England, which still permits that bloody and hideous worship? Had the English, instead of the Spaniards, conquered Mexico, the horrid human sacrifices would, in all probability, still continue to be offered up in hundreds of thousands every year throughout the whole land of Anahuac!

---

[1] Vol. i, p. 271.

[2] Ibid, pp. 271-2.

[3] Ibid. p. 360.

We said that the Catholic missionaries, who accompanied the expedition of the Conquest, uniformly opposed every species of violence towards either the bodies or the souls of the natives. There is no exception to this remark, the truth of which we will now briefly establish on the authority of Mr. Prescott himself. That such was the course of the benevolent Las Casas and of his brother Dominicans, needs no proof, other than what has been already given. Mr. Prescott furnishes us with copious extracts from the writings of Las Casas, developing his opinion as to the proper manner of proceeding in the conversion of the Indians:[1]

> "The only way of doing this," he says, "is by long, assiduous, and faithful preaching, until the heathen shall gather some ideas of the true nature of the Deity, and of the doctrines they are to embrace. Above all, the lives of the Christians should be such as to exemplify the truth of these doctrines, that seeing this, the poor Indian may glorify the Father, and acknowledge Him who has such worshipers for the true and only God."

But the missionary, who exercised the greatest influence in softening the horrors of the Conquest, and in checking the headlong zeal of Cortes and his associates, was the great and good father Bartolomé de Olmedo. His course was uniform. His voice was always for mercy and mildness. Mr. Prescott fully sustains us in this assertion. He says:

> "It was fortunate for Cortes that Olmedo was not one of those frantic (!) friars, who would have fanned his fiery temper on such occasions into a blaze. It might have had a most disastrous influence on his fortunes; for he held all temporal consequences light in comparison with the great work of conversion. . . But Olmedo belonged to that class of benevolent missionaries—of whom the Roman Catholic Church, to its credit, has furnished many examples—who rely on spiritual weapons for the great work, inculcating those doctrines of love and mercy which can best touch the sensibilities and win the affections of their rude audience. These, indeed, are the true weapons of the Church, the weapons employed in the primitive ages, by which it has spread its peaceful banners over the farthest regions of the globe."[2]

In another place, he draws the following beautiful sketch of the character of Olmedo:

> "In the course of our narrative, we have had occasion to witness more than once the good effects of the interposition of Father Olmedo. Indeed, it is scarcely too much to say, that his discretion in spiritual matters contributed as essentially to the success of the expedition, as did the sagacity and courage of Cortes in temporal. He was a true disciple of the school of Las Casas. His heart was unscathed by that fiery fanaticism which sears and hardens whatever it touches. It melted with the warm glow of Christian charity. He had come out to the new world as a missionary among the heathen, and he shrank from no sacrifice, but that

---

[1] Vol. iii, Appendix No 6, and vol. i, p. 272—*note*.

[2] Vol. i, pp. 403–4.

of the welfare of the poor benighted flock to whom he had consecrated his days. If he had followed the banners of the warrior, it was to mitigate the ferocity of war, and to turn the triumphs of the cross to a good account for the natives themselves, by the spiritual labors of conversion. He afforded the uncommon example, not to have been looked for certainly in a Spanish monk of the sixteenth century (!)—of enthusiasm controlled by reason, a quickening zeal tempered by the mild spirit of toleration."[1]

Jeronimo de Aquilar was another of those benevolent missionaries, who accompanied the expedition of the Conquest, who contributed greatly to its success, and who by his mildness and virtues exercised a most humanizing influence on its destinies. He had been for eight years a captive among the natives of Yucatan, and, after having been rescued by the Spaniards, he rendered them invaluable services in the capacity of interpreter. Mr. Prescott gives the following account of the virtues he manifested during his long captivity:

"Aquilar . . . fell into the hands of a powerful cazique who, though he spared his life, treated him at first with great rigor. The patience of the captive, however, and his singular humility, touched the better feelings of the chieftain, who would have persuaded Aquilar to take a wife among his people, but the ecclesiastic steadily refused, in obedience to his vows. This admirable constancy excited the distrust of the cazique, who put his virtue to a severe test by various temptations, and much of the same sort as those with which the devil is said to have assailed St. Anthony. From all these fiery trials, however, like his ghostly predecessor, he came out unscorched. Continence is too rare and difficult a virtue with barbarians, not to challenge their veneration, and the practice of it has made more than one saint[2] in the old as well as the new world. Aquilar was now entrusted with the care of his master's household and his numerous wives. He was a man of discretion as well as virtue, and his counsels were found so salutary, that he was consulted on all important matters. In short, Aquilar became a great man among the Indians."[3]

Besides the two missionaries just named, there accompanied the Conquest two others of a kindred spirit: Father Juan Diaz, the intimate friend of Olmedo; and Father Gomara, the chaplain of Cortes, and subsequently one of the most famous chroniclers of the expedition. These good men both labored with unremitting zeal, not only for the conversion of the natives, but also for the spiritual welfare of the Spanish army. And though they could not repress every moral disorder, yet were they cheered, on witnessing the eminently religious spirit and the piety of the soldiers under their spiritual charge. Never was there, perhaps, an army animated with a more lively faith in an all-directing Providence, or more regular in prayer and other religious duties. They were in the habit of assisting at the holy sacrifice of the Mass every morning, no matter what or how critical the condition in which they found themselves. "This punctual performance of Mass by the army," says Mr. Prescott, "in storm and in sunshine, by day and by night, among friends and enemies, draws forth a warm eulogium from the arch-episcopal editor of Cortes."[4]

---

[1] Vol. i, pp. 480–1,

[2] None of them Protestants.

[3] Ibid. pp. 274–5.

[4] Vol. iii, p. 187—*note*. The historian in intimating that Mass was sometimes celebrated "by night," does not give the true sense of the passage which he quotes from Archbishop Lorenzana, who

Did difficulties and dangers encompass the little Spartan band of Conquerors; were the soldiers, exhausted with fatigue and bleeding with wounds, on the point of falling into the hands of myriads of enemies panting to pour out their blood on the fatal stone of sacrifice; did all human sucoor seem to be cut off;—they raised their imploring hands to heaven in fervent supplication; nor was heaven ever deaf to their prayers! Did victory perch on their banners;—they sent forth the solemn Te Deum in thanksgiving to God! No one who has read attentively the history of the Conquest in the original authors, can fail to remark this peculiarly religious character of the Conquerors. The dispatches of Cortes breathe this spirit from beginning to end: honest Bernal Diaz's History, and Gomara's Chronicle of the Conquest, as well as the works of almost all the other historians of the expedition, are full of this same spirit. Even the cold and polished Mr. Prescott, much as he hates the religion of the Conquerors, sometimes enters into and does justice to their religious feelings, and even shares somewhat in their enthusiasm as soldiers of the cross. We must confine ourselves to two or three extracts on this subject, which will also be pretty good specimens of the style and manner of the historian.

In no part of Anahuac, as we have seen, did the Spaniards have to encounter more desperate difficulties and perils than in their many fierce contests with the brave and warlike Tlascalans. In vain did they triumph, time and again, over these indomitable enemies: after each dearly bought victory, the fierce Tlascalans came back with fresh troops and renewed courage to the conflict, stunning the ears of the exhausted and crippled Spaniards with their terrible war-cry, and threatening them with the awful menace, "that their flesh should be hewn from their bodies for sacrifice to the gods." In the midst of these awful difficulties, the Spaniards had need of all their faith and chivalrous heroism, as soldiers of the cross:

> "This bold defiance fell heavily on the ears of the Spaniards, not prepared for so pertinacious a spirit in their enemy. They had had ample proof of his courage and formidable prowess. They were now, in their crippled condition, to encounter him with a still more terrible array of numbers. The war, too, from the horrible fate with which it menaced the vanquished, wore a peculiarly gloomy aspect, that pressed heavily on their spirits. 'We feared death,' says the lion-hearted Diaz, with his usual simplicity, 'for we were men.' There was scarcely one in the army, that did not confess himself that night to the Reverend Father Olmedo, who was occupied nearly the whole of it, with administering absolution, or the other blessed offices of the Church. Armed with the holy sacraments, the Catholic soldier lay tranquilly down to rest, prepared for any fate that might betide him under the banner of the cross."[1]

The creation of a fleet on the lakes surrounding the great capital of the Aztecs, was, perhaps, the master-stroke of policy of the entire expedition.

---

only says, that though the Spaniards "labored day and night, yet Mass was never omitted, in order that the whole work might be atrributed to God."—"En el campo, en una calzada, entre enemigos, trabajando dia y noche, nunca se omitia la Missa, paraque toda la obra se attribuyesse a Dios"

[1] Vol. 1, pp. 436-7.

Mr. Prescott gives the following fine description of the religious ceremonies accompanying the launching of the brigantines composing this gallant little squadron,— the first fitted out in the new world:

> "Cortes was resolved that so auspicious an event should be celebrated with due solemnity. On the 28th of April, the troops were drawn up under arms, and the whole population of Tezcuco assembled to witness the ceremony. Mass was performed, and every man in the army, together with the General, confessed and received the sacrament. Prayers were offered up by Father Olmedo, and a benediction invoked on the little navy, the first — worthy of the name — ever launched on American waters. The signal was given by the firing of a cannon, when the vessels dropping down the canal, one after another, reached the lake in good order; and, as they emerged on its ample bosom, with music sounding, and the royal ensign of Castile proudly floating from their masts, a shout of admiration arose from the countless multitudes of spectators, which mingled with the roar of artillery and musketry from the vessels and the shore! It was a novel spectacle to the simple natives; and they gazed with wonder on the gallant ships, which, fluttering like sea-birds on their snowy pinions, bounded lightly over the waters, as if rejoicing in their element. It touched the stern hearts of the Conquerors with a glow of rapture, and, as they felt that heaven had blessed their undertaking, they broke forth by general accord into the noble anthem of the Te Deum."[1]

We close our extracts on this subject with the passage, in which our historian finely describes the thanksgiving after the glorious termination of the siege by the fall of Tenochtitlan. Intoxicated with their splendid victory, the Spanish soldiers were at first inclined to give way to inordinate rejoicing; but soon, at the voice of Father Olmedo, their enthusiastic jubilee was made to assume a religious character:

> "Loud and long was their revelry, which was carried to such an excess, as provoked the animadversion of Father Olmedo, who intimated that this was not the fitting way to testify their sense of the favors shown them by the Almighty. Cortes admitted the justice of the rebuke, but craved some indulgence for a soldier's license in the hour of victory. The following day was appointed for the commemoration of their successes in a more suitable manner. A procession of the whole army was then formed, with Father Olmedo at its head. The soiled and tattered banners of Castile, which had waved over many a field of battle, now threw their shadows on the peaceful array of the soldiery, as they slowly moved along rehearsing the litany, and displaying the image of the Virgin and the blessed symbol of man's redemption. The Reverend Father pronounced a discourse, in which he briefly reminded the troops of their cause of thankfulness to Providence for conducting them safe through their long and perilous pilgrimage; and, dwelling on the responsibility incurred by their present position, he besought them not to abuse the rights of conquest, *but to treat the unfortunate Indians with humanity.* The sacrament was then administered to the commander-in-chief and the principal cavaliers, and the services concluded with a solemn thanksgiving to the God of battles, who had enabled them to carry the banner of the cross triumphant over this barbaric empire."[2]

---

[1] Vol. iii, pp. 87, 88.

[2] Vol. iii, pp. 213, 214. Those who may wish to see more on this branch of the subject are referred to the following among many other passages of our author: vol. i, pp. 284, 287, 470, 473; vol. ii, pp 163, 256, 257; and vol. iii, pp. 143, 104, 151, &c

We have already seen what was the character of the missionary pioneers who accompanied the expedition of the Conquest; taming its ferocity, or turning away its mitigated horrors from the poor, stricken, and vanquished natives. We have seen how the banner of the cross, preceding or planted by the side of that of earthly conquest, elevated the character, and subdued the violence of the latter. We must now briefly treat of the Catholic missionaries who labored among the Indians, during the years immediately following the Conquest. For the spirit which animated them, for their unquenchable zeal to promote the salvation of the natives, and for the eminent success which crowned their labors, we would ask no better witness than the deeply prejudiced, though highly accomplished Mr. Prescott. Having space for but little commentary, we shall confine ourselves almost entirely to his unexceptionable testimony; from which it will appear that Father Olmedo was not alone in the inculcation and practice of every Christian and priestly virtue. Speaking of the interposition of Cortes to obtain additional missionaries from Spain, our author says:

> "Whatever disregard he may have shown to the political rights of the natives, Cortes manifested a commendable solicitude for their spiritual welfare. He requested the emperor to send out holy men to the country; not bishops and pampered prelates, who too often squandered the substance of the Church in riotous living, but godly persons, members of religious fraternities, whose lives might be a fitting commentary on their teaching. Thus only, he adds,—and the remark is worthy of note,—can they exercise any influence over the natives, who have been accustomed to see the least departure from morals in their own priesthood punished with the utmost rigor of the law. In obedience to these suggestions, twelve Franciscan friars embarked for New Spain, which they reached early in 1524."[1]

Of their character and reception in Mexico, he speaks as follows:

> "They were men of unblemished piety of life, nourished with the learning of the cloister, and, like many others whom the Romish (!) Church has sent forth on such apostolic missions, counted all personal sacrifices as little in the sacred cause to which they were devoted. The presence of the reverend fathers in the country was greeted with general rejoicing. The inhabitants of the towns through which they passed came out in a body to welcome them; processions were formed of the natives bearing wax tapers in their hands, and the bells of the churches rung out a joyous peal in honor of their arrival. Houses of refreshment were provided along their route to the capital; and when they entered it, they were met by a brilliant cavalcade of the principal cavaliers and citizens, with Cortes at their head. The General dismounting, and bending one knee to the ground, kissed the robes of Father Martin of Valencia, the principal of the fraternity. The natives, filled with amazement at the viceroy's humiliation before men whose naked feet and tattered garments gave them the aspect of mendicants, henceforth regarded them as beings of a superior nature. The Indian chronicler of Tlascala does not conceal his admiration of this edifying condescension of Cortes, which he pronounces 'one of the most heroical acts of his life.'"[2]

---

[1] Vol. iii, pp. 364-5.

[2] Ibid. pp. 260-6.

Of the labors and success of these excellent missionaries our historian says:

> "The missionaries lost no time in the good work of conversion. They began their preaching through interpreters, until they had acquired a competent knowledge of the language themselves. They *opened schools* and *founded colleges*, in which the native youth were instructed in *profane* as well as Christian learning. The ardor of the Indian neophyte emulated that of his teacher. In a few years every vestige of the primitive *Teocallis* was effaced from the land. The uncouth idols of the country, and unhappily the hieroglyphical manuscripts, shared the same fate. Yet the missionary and the convert did much to repair these losses by their copious accounts of the Aztec institutions, collected from the most authentic sources."[1]

We may here remark, that, but for the indefatigable labors of Father Sahagun, and of other Catholic missionary antiquaries, we would, in all probability, now have no account whatever of the Aztec institutions. Had they not, with the aid of the Indian converts, deciphered the pictorial writings of the Mexicans, what modern antiquary would now be able to unfold their meaning? Has one even attempted it with any thing like success? That all the Aztec manuscripts have not perished, is manifest from the large collections to which Lord Kingsborough had access, and from those still preserved in the museum of the Propaganda at Rome, and in other places. But has the world grown much wiser, on the subject of the Aztec antiquities, from perusing the *insignes nugæ* which cover the splendid pages of Lord Kingsborough's work? Of Father Sahagun, the greatest of all the Mexican antiquaries, Mr. Prescott speaks as follows:

> "Father Sahagun, who has done better service in this way than others of his order, describes with simple brevity the rapid work of demolition (of the Aztec *Teocallis, stained with the blood of human victims*). 'We took the children of the caziques,' he says, 'into our schools, where we taught them to read, write, and to chant. The children of the poorer natives were brought together in the court-yard, and there instructed in the Christian faith. After our teaching, one or two brethren took the pupils to some neighboring *Teocalli*, and, by working at it for a few days, they levelled it to the ground. In this way they demolished, in a short time, all the Aztec temples, great and small, so that not a vestige of them remained.'"[2]

What modern *Christian* antiquary will drop a tear of regret over those demolished temples, dedicated to an inhuman worship? Was not their destruction absolutely necessary, to eradicate from the minds of the converts all temptations to revert to their antiquated superstitions? Totally unfitted for the purposes of the Christian worship, they did but burden the soil with their cumbrous and misshapen bulk; and their fall was a necessary preliminary to the introduction of Christianity. And yet there are found many kind and sympathetic souls, even among *Christians*, who bitterly lament the fall of the Aztec *Teocallis!* Would these men: would the polished Mr. Prescott, weep, if the hideous and blood-stained car of Juggernaut were dashed into fragments? Would their antiquarian, in this case, get the better of their Christian zeal? We are really curious to know what these enlightened gentlemen would have said, had the English government possessed Christianity enough to abolish the bloody and inhuman worship prevalent in India.

---

[1] Vol. iii, pp 266-7.

[2] Ibid—*note*.

Of the astonishing success which crowned the labors of the missionaries among the Mexicans, our author speaks as follows:

> "The business of conversion went on prosperously among the several tribes of the great Nahuatlac family. In about twenty years from the first advent of the missionaries, one of their body (Father Toribio) could make the pious vaunt, that nine millions of converts—a number probably exceeding the population of the country—had been admitted within the Christian fold!"[1]

The intelligent reader is left to decide between the "probable" conjecture of our modern historian, and the positive testimony of a grave cotemporary writer, of undoubted veracity, who relates what he himself saw, and in what he was a prominent actor. Even allowing that the fervid zeal of the good missionary led him into some exaggeration, it will still remain certain, that the number of converts was prodigious and almost staggering belief.

How are we to explain this remarkable fact? Can it be accounted for on merely human principles; or must we have recourse to a divine interposition? Were the natives induced to embrace Christianity in such vast numbers, by natural or by supernatural causes? If the former, how then are we to explain the remarkable phenomenon? If the latter, then is it not apparent, that the Roman Catholic religion, thus wonderfully blessed by God, and impressed with the seal of His approbation, is that true religion, which Christ died to establish, and whose ministry He divinely commissioned "to teach all nations?"

We will devote the remainder of this paper—already long enough—to a brief investigation of this important matter; and we regret that our limits will necessarily compel us to pass over many other things, connected with the Religious Point of View of the Conquest, upon which we had originally intended to animadvert. Such is among many other things, the peculiarly religious character of Cortes, which stood forth strong even in death.[2]

Mr. Prescott's theory for explaining the conversion of the natives to Catholic Christianity is surely simple enough. It strongly reminds us of the theory of another very polished gentleman, Gibbon, for explaining the early progress of Christianity among the Greeks and Romans. Both of these philosophers wholly discard miracles and every thing supernatural; and both draw pretty strongly on their fancies for the natural causes, which they think, sufficiently explain the phenomenon. The following passage, to a portion of which we directed attention in our first paper, appears to contain the gist of Mr. Prescott's theory for explaining the conversion of the Aztecs:

---

[1] Vol. iii, p. 267.

[2] See an account of his death, and of his last will and testament, in Prescott, vol. iii.

"The Aztec worship was remarkable for its burdensome ceremonial, and prepared its votaries for the pomp and splendors of the Romish (!) ritual. It was not difficult to pass from the fasts and festivals of the one religion, to the fasts and festivals of the other; to transfer their homage from the fantastic idols of their own creation to the beautiful forms in sculpture and in painting which decorated the Christian cathedral."[1]

We protest with all our energy against this false and odious parallel, between two systems of religion as different from each other as light is from darkness. What! Compare the venerable religion of three-fourths of the Christian world, embracing too the most polished and enlightened nations of the earth; — compare the religion, which was the only Christian one on the face of the earth for the first fifteen hundred years of Christianity; — compare the religion which preserved the Bible, which taught *all* the nations Christianity, which was ever the fruitful mother of Christians and the parent of Christian civilization; — compare the religion which has been the teeming mother of republics and of heroes; — compare the religion of such men as Fenelon, Xavier, De Sales, Borromeo, Cheverus, Olmedo, and thousands of other bright ornaments of human nature and of Christian society: — compare this venerable religion, with the impure, the abominable, the inhuman, the blood-stained, the hideous superstition of the degraded Aztecs! O Mr. Prescott! smooth, polished, refined Mr. Prescott! How sadly has thy prejudice against the religion of *thy* fathers betrayed thee! Cast off that dark cloud, which envelopes an otherwise beautiful, clear, and noble intellect. It is wholly unworthy of thee, and will add nothing to the brightness of thy posthumous fame.

Was it then so easy a thing for the Aztecs to renounce their time-honored worship, intimately connected as it was with their early history, and associated with the most brilliant deeds of their heroes, and the glory of their empire? Was it so easy for them to trample upon rites, so closely intertwined with their national manners and customs; with their warlike displays, and with their peaceful pageants and festivals; with their patriotic feelings, and with their very existence as a people? Was it so very easy for them to resign a religion which flattered the passions, in favor of one which imposed so many severe restraints on them, to renounce a religion pandering to impurity and every abomination, in favor of what Mr. Prescott, *in this very passage*, called the UNSULLIED rites of Catholic Christianity?

That the Aztecs clung with great tenacity to their abominable superstitions; that they could not be induced to renounce them without the greatest difficulty, Mr. Prescott himself is our witness. He tells us of the fierce resistance the Spaniards every where met with, whenever they proposed a change of religion to the natives; he tells us of the stern opposition of the weak Montezuma; he tells us of the awful death-struggle of the Aztecs for their religion and their independence, when they exhibited their willingness to be buried under the ruins of their besieged capital, rather than yield to the Conquerors; and he tells us how, in this last desperate conflict, their enthusiasm was kindled by the appeals of their priests, how it received additional warmth from the fires which burned on the summits of their *Teocallis*, and how it was increased to wild fanaticism and absolute madness, by the sounds which were sent forth by the signal drum of the great temple of their war-god. And yet, it was easy for them to renounce all this superstition, and to embrace in its stead the painful religion of their Conquerors!

---

[1] Vol. iii, pp. 267-8.

Or, is it to be made a matter of crimination against the Catholic Church, that the "pomp and splendor" of her ritual won the admiration and captivated the senses of the natives? Is it her fault, that the religion she teaches possesses more charms and more winning graces than the "cold abstractions" of Protestantism; that it appeals not only to the mind, but also to the heart? Was it her fault, that even the barbarous Aztecs were compelled to admire her divine beauty, and to be forcibly struck with her "heavenly hue?" Was it a fault in her to have wisely tolerated, at least for a time, such of the Aztec national usages as warred with no principle of her faith, and to have proceeded gradually with the civilization of the natives? Had not such been the wise mode of procedure adopted, according to the testimony of the Protestant church historian Mosheim,[1] by Christian missionaries from the earliest ages of the Church? Had not the enlightened Pontiff, St. Gregory the Great, recommended this same prudent course of conduct to St. Augustine, the apostle of England?[2] And had it no been adopted in both cases, with the most beneficial results, and without the sacrifice of any principle of faith? Was it any harm to consecrate to the service of the true God, in the "unsullied" worship of Catholicity, rites which, harmless in themselves, had been hitherto employed in an impure and abominable superstition? And is it probable, as Mr. Prescott insinuates, that the Catholic missionaries, whom himself represents as men "of unblemished purity of life," only sought, in the conversion of the natives, to substitute one form of idolatry for another?

True it is — and it makes nothing against our argument — that the missionaries discovered among the Aztecs many religious tenets and observances, which forcibly reminded them of some peculiar institutions of Catholicity, and almost compelled the belief that their ancestors had been originally indoctrinated in Christianity. If they were right in this inference, the coincidences alluded to afford a strong corroborative evidence of the antiquity and divine origin of those Catholic doctrines. Besides the cross, as a symbol of worship, the Aztecs had religious rites which very nearly resembled the Catholic sacraments of the holy eucharist and baptism. Let us hear Mr. Prescott:

"Their surprise was heightened, when they witnessed a religious rite which reminded them of the Christian communion. On these occasions, an image of the tutelary deity of the Aztecs was made of the flour of maize, mixed with blood, and, after consecration by the priests, was distributed among the people, who, as they ate it, 'showed signs of humiliation and sorrow, declaring it was the flesh of the deity.'[1] How could the Roman Catholic fail to recognize the awful ceremony of the eucharist?"[2] .... With the same feelings, they witnessed another ceremony, that of the Aztec baptism; in which, after a solemn invocation, the head and lips of the infant were touched with water, and a name was given to it; while the goddess Cioacoatl, who presided over childbirth, was implored, 'that the sin, *which was given to us before the beginning of the world*, might not visit the child, but that, *cleansed by these waters*, it might live and *be born anew*.'"[3]

---

[1] Historia Ecclesiast. Sæcul. II, p. 2, c. iv, *nota*.

[2] Cf. Lingard, Antiquities Anglo-Saxon Church, p. 24, American edition. M. Fithian, Philadelphia, 1841.

These coincidences were striking enough; and they surely went far towards warranting the conclusion of the missionaries. But, mixed up as those *quasi*-Christian rites were, with the most abominable superstitions of a worship stained with human gore, they could not greatly facilitate the adoption by the natives of the "unsullied rites" of Catholic Christianity. Something more than a mere partial coincidence; something more than mere human power or mere human means, was necessary to bring about, with such astonishing rapidity, the complete and general conversion of the Aztecs. The finger of God was there, as clearly as it was in the conversion of any heathen nation that ever entered the Christian fold. We can explain the phenomenon on no other principle. The mere zeal, and unblemished purity, and devotedness of the Catholic missionaries, however they may have aided, could not, of themselves, without the divine favor and blessing, have accomplished the work. Unless God build the house, in vain do they labor who build it."

Mr. Prescott, like Gibbon and most others of the modern fashionable historical school, has a pious horror of all miracles. He proceeds on the *assumption*, that "the age of miracles has ceased;" for which position there seems to be no other ground, than the acknowledged fact, that such wonders have wholly ceased among Protestants! But is "the right hand of God shortened?" Or did Christ set any limitation as to time, to the numerous promises he made to his disciples in regard to the power conferred on them for working miracles? If there be any truth in history, it is certain that miracles have been wrought in every age, and in every great emergency of the Church. One of these emergencies, strongly demanding such an exhibition of divine power, is the conversion of a heathen nation to Christianity. Surely then, if ever, miracles should be performed; and, notwithstanding our historian's skepticism, we incline to the belief that they were performed in the conversion of Mexico. We will give two instances, to which Mr. Prescott alludes with a lurking sneer, or with open unbelief.

The first is the resurrection of the sister of Tanzapan, lord of Michuacan, after she had been dead four days. The fact was believed by her brother, as yet a heathen, who, at her instance, disbanded a powerful army which he had collected to march against the Spaniards. It also commemorated in the Michuacan Picture-Records; and is related by Ixtlilxochitl, the Indian lord and historian of Tezcuco, who derived it from a grandson of Tanzapan.[1] Is such evidence as this to be invalidated by the mere skeptical doubt of Mr. Prescott?

---

[1] The author here quotes Veytia, Hist. Antigua, L. I. c. 18; and Acosta, Lib, 5. c. 24.

[2] Vol. iii, pp. 384–5.

[3] Ibid. p. 385. For this remarkable doctrine of the Aztecs, Mr. Prescott cites the great antiquary, Sahagun. Hist. de Nueva Espagna, l. vi, c. 33.

The other miraculous occurrence alluded to took place at Tlascala. We will give it in the words of Mr, Prescott, who says in a note:—"the miracle is reported by Herrera, and *believed* by Solis:"—

> "A large cross was erected in one of the great courts or squares. Mass was celebrated every day in the presence of the army and of crowds of natives, who, if they did not comprehend its full import, were so far edified, that they learned to reverence the religion of their Conquerors. The direct interposition of heaven, however, wrought more for their conversion than the best homily of priest or soldier. Scarcely had the Spaniards left the city — the tale (!) is told on very respectable authority — when a thin, transparent cloud descended and settled like a column on the cross, and, wrapping it round in its luminous folds, continued to emit a soft, celestial radiance through the night, thus proclaiming the sacred character of the symbol, on which was shed the halo of divinity."[2]

But we must bring our remarks to a close. Few can have failed to notice the striking coincidence, in point of time, of the remarkable defection from the ranks of Catholicity in the old, and of the more remarkable additions to her numbers in the new world. At the very time that the reformation was making the most rapid progress in Europe, tearing whole nations from the bosom of the Church, and threatening her with total destruction; this Church, far from being appalled by the danger which menaced her very existence at home, arose in her heavenly strength, and, indued with the vigor of youth, stretched forth her gigantic arms to the east and to the west, grasped at spiritual empire in new worlds which her children had discovered, and reared in triumph her glorious banner of the cross — which had been despised at home — in the heart of new nations and of new peoples, who "rose up and called her blessed!" She thus became more Catholic *after*, than she had been *before*, the reformation, so called! Her Xaviers, her Olmedos, her Martins of Valencia, and her other indefatigable missionaries, more than retrieved her losses in the old world, by additional conquests to her communion in the new.

So it had been in every great emergency of her history. At the very periods in which she had been threatened with the greatest dangers, she had not only come out victorious from the struggle which menaced her very existence, but she had acquired new vigor, and had marched on to new conquests! Who will say that the finger of God is not in all this? Who can explain it in any other way, than by admitting that a mysterious Providence watches over her; and that the God who said: "THE GATES OF HELL SHALL NOT PREVAIL AGAINST HER," has fully redeemed His promise?

---

[1] Prescott admits all this, vol. iii, p. 19, note.

[2] Vol. i, pp. 481, 482.

XV. EARLY CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN THE NORTHWEST

FIRST PAPER.—BANCROFT'S ACCOUNT.*

Bancroft as an historian — An old *Relation* — Catholic missionary zeal — Spirit of Catholic and Protestant colonists compared — Who established the first missions in North America? — The Franciscans and Jesuits — The first Jesuit missionaries — The first college — And the first hospital — The Ursulines in Canada — The mission to the Hurons — Fathers De Brebeuf and Daniel — Their manner of life — The chief Ahasistari — Mission to the Algonquins — And to the Chippewas —"The New England Elliott" — Father Jogues—And Father Bressani — Mission among the Abanakis — Mohawks — Onondagas — And Cayugas — Extent of the missions — Penetrating westward — Father Marquette — His death — Subsequent history of the Jesuit missions — Policy of England.

The history of the early Catholic missions in Canada and in the northwestern portion of the United States, inimately connected as it is with that of our country itself, cannot fail to awaken the attention and excite the interest of every American, who is curious to investigate the rise and progress of our early Colonies. The civil history of the country cannot, in fact, be written without drawing copiously on the facts comprised in its early religious annals.

Bancroft, in his History of the United States, has devoted an entire chapter to this very interesting subject, so far as it came within his general scope. Considering that he is a Protestant, he has certainly been as impartial as could have been expected, in recounting the labors of the early Catholic missionaries among the Indians; and, though he has done them nothing more than justice, Catholics, who are usually grateful for small favors in this way, owe him a debt of gratitude.

He has availed himself of the excellent history of Charlevoix, as well as of the detailed accounts, or *Relations*, of the Jesuit missionaries themselves. As far as he goes, he is generally accurate; but we regret that he has confined himself to the first fifty years of these missions, embracing the period from 1632 to 1680. His style is brilliant and sparkling, but wanting in that natural simplicity which best suits historical narratives, especially those which treat of religious subjects. The accounts of the Jesuit fathers, from which he borrows copiously, possess this charming quality in an eminent degree. We have also detected, here and there, a lurking sneer, intended, we apprehend, as a douceur to Protestant prejudice. Yet withal, there is an apparent impartiality, and a certain air of candor and liberality pervading this portion of his History.

---

* Bancroft's History of the United States, Vol. iii, Chapter xx.

Chance lately threw into our way one of the oldest and most interesting of those *Relations*, to which the American historian so often refers. It is a duodecimo volume of 103 pages, was printed at Paris in 1650, and it is entitled: "A Relation of what passed in the Mission of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus among the Hurons, a territory of New France, in the years 1648 and 1649."[1] This narrative is written in that simple manner and unctious spirit, which at once delights and edifies the reader. It enters into the most minute and interesting details, furnishes many thrilling anecdotes, and, by its copiousness, will enable the reader of Bancroft to supply the deficiency of his comparatively meagre account. We shall draw copiously on this little work; but before we introduce our readers to its interesting contents, we must rapidly review, and summarily condense, the account of the early Jesuit missions as given by the American historian, whose authority in this matter is surely unexceptionable.

It is the glory of the Catholic Church, to have been in all ages signalized by successful missionary zeal. From the day that her first ministers heard the divine command, "Go, teach all nations,"—down to the present time, she has ever burned with an ardent zeal for the instruction and salvation of mankind. She alone has, in every age, fulfilled this divine commission; she alone has converted the nations; she alone has ever been the true and fruitful mother of civilization. After the lapse of more than eighteen hundred years, the same fire still glows in the bosom of her missionaries, as warmed the breasts of the first apostles of the Lamb.

At every period of her history, her clergy have been among the chief pioneers of civilization. The Cross always accompanied, sometimes it even preceded, the banner of earthly conquest. Zeal for the salvation of souls was the very life and soul of every maritime enterprise, and of all expeditions for conquest. The sword subjected the bodies, the Cross won the hearts, of all those who successively entered the ever widening pale of the Christian civilization.

So it had been in South, so it was also in North America. In both, Catholics had the honor of first pioneering the way. In both, the Catholic clergy established the first missions, and made the first proselytes to Christianity among the aboriginal inhabitants. The Catholic French in the North were animated by a spirit of religious zeal, similar to that which had actuated the Catholic Spaniards in the more Southern portion of the continent. Let us hear what Bancroft testifies on the subject:

> "Religious zeal, not less than commercial ambition, had influenced France to recover Canada; and Champlain, its governor, whose imperishable name will rival with posterity the fame of Smith and of Hudson, ever disinterested and compassionate, full of honor and probity, of ardent devotion and burning zeal, esteemed 'the salvation of a soul worth more than the conquest of an empire.'"[2]

---

[1] "Relation de ce qui est passé en la Mission des Peres de la Compagnie de Jesus aux Hurons, pays de la Nouvelle France, aux années 1648 et 1649. Par. P. Paul Raguenau, de la mesme Compagnie." A Paris, 1650.

[2] Vol. iii, p. 119.

Again he says:

"Thus it was neither commercial enterprise, nor royal ambition, which carried the power of France into the heart of our continent: the motive was religion. Religious enthusiasm colonized New-England; and religious enthusiasm founded Montreal, made a conquest of the wilderness on the upper lakes, and explored the Mississippi. Puritanism gave New England its worship and its schools; the Roman (Catholic) Church created for Canada its altars, its hospitals, and its seminaries."[1]

The religious enthusiasm, which colonized New-England, was of a different kind altogether from that which founded and peopled Canada. Nowhere do we read, that the French Catholic pilgrims of Canada either enacted blue laws, persecuted each other for conscience sake, drove fellow Christians into the wilderness, or hanged people for witchcraft! Neither do we hear of their having overreached the Indians, driven them from post to post, and made war on and exterminated them, after having goaded them into desperation by insufferable exactions! Nor do we read of the Catholic clergy acting as chaplains to the armies which were marching to exterminate the poor aborigines, nor making long prayers at the head of the invading troops, on the eve of battle, as did the "godly Stone," when the colonists of New-England were marching against the Pequods of Connecticut! In all these things, and in many more, the glory is all on the side of the Puritans!

Again, the policy pursued by the two sets of colonists, for extending the boundaries of their respective territories, was widely different. The Puritans seem to have thought very little about converting and civilizing the aborigines. Missionary enterprise among them seldom, if ever, preceded shrewd contracts for additional territory, or expeditions for conquest; they rarely ever followed either. The Puritans seem to have thought little about the bodies, and still less about the souls of the poor Indians. Their conversion to Christianity was an after consideration; the acquisition of their lands was the primary object of Puritan missionary zeal.

We read indeed of a feeble, and, in a great measure, unsuccessful effort of the Puritan minister John Elliott, to convert the miserable remnants of the Indian tribes, which the *humanity* of the pious pilgrims had suffered still to drag out a miserable existence in the immediate vicinity of Boston. We read also of a most disgraceful attempt made by ministers sent from Boston to break up the flourishing Catholic missions established among the Abenakis of Maine, by the sainted Catholic missionary, Sebastian Rasles. Mr. Bancroft himself, a great advocate for the Puritans, is our witness for all these facts; to which we shall have occasion to refer more fully hereafter.[2]

On the contrary, the same historian assures us, that "the genius of Champlain ..... could devise no method of building up the dominion of France in Canada, but by an alliance with the Hurons, or of confirming that alliance but by the establishment of missions." And he adds: "Such a policy was congenial to a Church which cherishes every member of the human race, without regard to lineage or skin."[1] The genius of the pilgrims devised other means altogether, for establishing Puritan dominion in New England. The policy of their church, or churches, seems also to have been very widely different. They were far too enlightened to cherish the tawny-skinned Indians: their delicate nerves were even greatly shocked at the bare sight of an ugly old woman, who happened to have a mole on her skin,—a certain indication that she was a witch! The sublime sentiment of Champlain, "who esteemed the salvation of a soul worth more than the conquest of an empire," seems never to have entered their narrow minds!

---

[1] Vol. iii, p. 121.

[2] In the Review of Webster's Bunker Hill Speech.

The glory of having discovered America, and of having established the first colonies, the first missions, the first college, and the first charitable institutions in North America, belongs entirely to the Catholic religion. Mr. Bancroft's authority bears us out in all these assertions. The Franciscans were the first Catholic missionaries, and the first of any kind, who labored among the Indian tribes of North America.[2] As early as the year 1615, we find Franciscan missionaries among the Indians of Maine. Our historian says:

> "The first permanent efforts of French enterprise, in colonizing America, preceded any permanent English settlement north of the Potomac. Years before the pilgrims anchored within Cape Cod, the Roman (Catholic) Church had been planted, by missionaries from France, in the eastern moiety of Maine; and Le Caron, an unambitious Franciscan, had penetrated the land of the Mohawks, had passed to the north in the hunting-grounds of the Wyandots, and, bound by his vows to the life of a beggar, had, on foot, or paddling a bark canoe, gone onward and still onward, taking alms of the savages, till he reached the rivers of Lake Huron. While Quebec contained scarce fifty inhabitants, priests of the Franciscan order—Le Caron, Viel, Sagard—had labored for years as missionaries in Upper Canada, or made their way to the neutral Huron tribe that dwelt on the waters of the Niagara."[3]

In 1632, the "Franciscans having, as a mendicant order, been excluded from the rocks and deserts of the new world, the office of converting the heathen of Canada, and thus enlarging the borders of French dominion, was entrusted solely to the Jesuits."[3] For this change the historian can assign no better motive, than that the Franciscans were a mendicant order—as if the Jesuits who succeeded them had not also taken the vow of poverty,—and the interposition of "devotees" at the French Court, which felt that the "aspiring honor of the Gallican church was interested."[4]

In the first place, it does not appear, even from Mr. Bancroft's own showing, that the Franciscans were wholly excluded from the missions of North America. For as late as 1680, we find that the Franciscan, Hennepin, and his associates of the same order, accompanied the expedition of La Salle for exploring the Mississippi. It was he who first penetrated to the Falls of St. Anthony,—so called by him after the patron of his expedition, St. Anthony of Padua. "On a tree near the cataract,

[1] Vol. iii, p. 121.

[2] Except those who labored in Mexico.

[3] Ibid. pp 118-19.

[4] Ibid. p 120.

[5] Ibid.

the Franciscan engraved the Cross and the arms of France; and, after a summer's rambles, diversified by a short captivity among the Sioux, he and his companions returned, by way of the Wisconsin and Fox rivers, to the French mission at Green Bay"[1]

Perhaps the intrinsic merits of the Jesuits, their more complete organization, and their greater adaptation to the Indian missions, had at least as much to do with their having been selected for this work by the French authorities, as the aspiring honor of the Gallican church, or the interference of court devotees. Mr. Bancroft himself does justice to the character of the Jesuits, and bears us out in our mode of explaining the action of the French court on the subject. After having well spoken of the first establishment of the Jesuit order,[2] he bears this testimony to the worth of the first missionaries of the society in Canada:

> "Within three years after the second occupation of Canada, (1633–36,) the number of Jesuit priests in the province reached fifteen; and every tradition bears testimony to their worth. They had the faults of ascetic superstition (!); but the horrors of a Canadian life in the wilderness, were resisted by an invincible passive courage, and a deep internal tranquillity. Away from the amenities of life, away from the opportunities of vain-glory, they became dead to the world, and possessed their souls in unalterable peace. The few who lived to grow old, though bowed down by the toils of a long mission, still kindled with the fervor of apostolic zeal. The history of their labors is connected with the origin of every celebrated town in the annals of French America; not a cape was turned, nor a river entered, but a Jesuit led the way."[3]

The first college in North America, as we have said, was founded by Catholics. Here we have also the authority of Bancroft, who moreover assigns the true cause which led to its establishment, — religious zeal:

> "To confirm the missions, the first measure was the establishment of a college in New France; and the parents of the Marquis de Gamache, pleased with his pious importunity, assented to his entering the order of the Jesuits, and added from their ample fortunes the means of endowing a seminary for education at Quebec. Its foundation was laid, under happy auspices, in 1635, just before Champlain passed from among the living, and two years before the emigration of John Harvard, and one year before the general Court of Massachusetts had made provision for a college."[4]

The first charitable institutions on our portion of the American continent were also of Catholic origin:

> "The fires of charity were at the same time enkindled. The dutchess D' Aiguillon, aided by her uncle, the Cardinal Richelieu, endowed a public hospital dedicated to the Son of God, whose blood was shed in mercy for all mankind. Its doors were opened, not only to the sufferers among the emigrants, but to the maimed, the sick, and the blind, of any of the numerous tribes between the Kennebec and Lake Superior; it relieved misfortune without asking its lineage. From the hospital nuns of Dieppe, three were selected, the youngest but twenty-two, to brave the famine and the rigors of Canada in their patient missions of benevolence."[5]

This noble example of self devoting zeal found admirers and imitators among the religious ladies of Catholic France; and another charitable institution was the result:

---

[1] Vol. iii, p. 127.
[2] Pp. 166-7.
[3] P. 120.
[4] Ibid. p. 122.
[5] P. 126.

> "The same religious enthusiasm, inspiring Madame de la Peltier, a young and opulent widow of Alenson, with the aid of a nun of Dieppe and two others from Tours, established the Ursuline convent for the education of girls. As the youthful heroines stepped on the shore at Quebec, (Aug. 1, 1639) they stooped to kiss the earth, which they adopted as their mother, and were ready, in case of need, to tinge with their blood. The governor, with the little garrison, received them at the water's edge; Hurons and Algonquins, joining in the shouts, filled the air with yells of joy; and the motley group escorted the new comers to the Church where, amidst a general thanksgiving, the *Te Deum* was chanted. Is it wonderful that the natives were touched by a benevolence, which their poverty and squalid misery could not appall? Their education was also attempted; and the venerable ash tree still lives, beneath which Mary of the Incarnation, so famed for chastened piety, genius, and good judgment, toiled, though in vain, for the culture of Huron children."[1]

The hearts of the natives were much more capable of being touched by deeds of heroic benevolence, than were those of the Puritans at no remote period. Every body knows how these were *touched*, when a branch of this same benevolent order of Ursuline ladies was established in the immediate vicinity of enlightened Boston. The mouldering ruins of Mount Benedict still stand, a proud monument of their benevolence and *burning* zeal! Shame on them, for their unmanly and cowardly treatment of harmless and benevolent females! The very savages, whom their forefathers so inhumanly butchered, would, if possible, arise from their tombs and blush for them, who have not yet learned to blush!

Two years before the establishment of the Ursulines in Quebec, the benevolent Silleri had already created another charitable institution for the civilization of the savages, (A. D. 1637):

> "Meantime, a colony of the Hurons had been established in the vicinity of Quebec; and the name of Silleri is the monument to the philanthropy of its projector. Here savages were to be trained to the faith and the manners of civilization."[2]

The Hurons were the first tribe of Indians to whom the Jesuits carried the light of the gospel. In 1634, Fathers John de Brebeuf and Anthony Daniel joined a party of barefoot Hurons who were returning from Quebec to their own country, situated to the North West of Lake Toronto, and near the shores of Lake Huron. The journey was long and painful; the distance was three hundred leagues, or nine hundred miles; the way lay through dense and unexplored forests, almost impassable marshes, along the Ottowa river and its waters, and over rugged hills and precipices. Over this difficult country, they had to carry their canoes on their shoulders whenever the Ottowa river and its tributary streams proved unnavigable:

> "And thus swimming, wading, paddling, or bearing the canoe across the portages, with garments torn, with feet mangled, yet with the breviary safely hung around the neck, and vows, as they advanced, to meet death

---

[1] Vol. iii, p. 127.

[2] Ibid.

twenty times over, if it were possible, the consecrated envoys made their way, by rivers, lakes, and forests, from Quebec to the heart of the Huron wilderness. There they raised the first humble house of the society of Jesus among the Hurons,—the cradle, it was said, of His Church, who dwelt at Bethlehem (*Nazareth?*) in a cottage. This little chapel, built by aid of the axe, and consecrated to St. Joseph, where, in the gaze of thronging crowds, vespers and matins began to be chanted, and the sacred bread was consecrated by solemn Mass, amazed the hereditary guardians of the council fires of the Huron tribes. Two new Christian villages, St. Louis and St. Ignatius, bloomed among the Huron forests."[1]

In another place, the historian thus describes the missionary life among the Hurons:

"The life of a missionary on Lake Huron was simple and uniform. The earliest hours, from four to eight, were absorbed in private prayer;[2] the day was given to schools, visits, instructions in the catechism, and a service for proselytes. Sometimes, after the manner of St. Francis Xavier, Brebeuf would walk through the village and its environs, ringing a little bell and inviting the Huron braves and counselors to a conference. There, under the shady forest, the most solemn mysteries of the Catholic faith were subjected to discussion."[3]

He gives the following very interesting account of the famous Huron Chief, Ahasistari:

"Nature had planted in his mind the seeds of religious faith. 'Before you came to this country,' he would say, 'when I have incurred the greatest perils, and have alone escaped, I have said to myself: some powerful spirit has the guardianship of my days;' and he professed his belief in Jesus, as the good genius and protector, whom he had before unconsciously adored. After trials of his sincerity, he was baptized; and, enlisting a troop of converts, savages like himself, 'let us strive,' he exclaimed, 'to make the whole world embrace the faith in Jesus.'"[4]

This last incident reminds us of the well known anecdote of the more martial king Clovis, the founder of the French monarchy, who, hearing the history of our Saviour's passion read to him while confined to a sick bed, leaped up, and exclaimed: "Why was I not there with my Franks?"

The Huron missions continued to flourish for the space of fifteen years: immense numbers of the Indians entered into the Christian fold, and many flourishing Christian villages were organized. The central mission, called *the Conception*, of which the chief house was St. Mary's, was situated on the Matchedash, a stream which unites Lakes Toronto and Huron. In one single year, three thousand red men from the different tribes shared the hospitality of the good fathers at this missionary station. At one time, the missionaries had no communication with Quebec or Montreal for the space of three whole years, (1641–1644) during which their clothing fell to pieces, and they suffered grievously for the necessaries of life. Still they persevered with the ardor of apostles, and their number went on constantly increasing. Let us again hear our historian:

"Yet the efforts of the Jesuits were not limited even to the Huron race.

---

[1] Vol. iii, p. 122–3.

[2] And Mass, which was celebrated every morning about sunrise, in presence of the neophytes.

[3] P. 125.

[4] Ibid.

Within thirteen years, this remote wilderness was visited by forty-two missionaries, members of the society of Jesus, besides eighteen others, who, if not initiated, were yet chosen men, ready to shed their blood for their faith. Twice or thrice a year, they all assembled at St. Mary's; for the rest of the time, they were scattered through the infidel tribes."[1]

We shall hereafter see how this flourishing mission was broken up by an incursion of the fierce Iroquois, the most deadly enemies of the Hurons. We will also have occasion to trace more in detail, from the old *Relation* alluded to, the wonderful fruits gathered in this first field of Jesuit missionary labors among the Indians. As this was the first mission, it was also a kind of model for all the others; and as we design, in our second and third papers, to dwell at some length on its history, we will be dispensed from here giving a detailed account of the missions among the other tribes. We will accordingly close this paper with a rapid glance at them, in taking which we will follow Mr. Bancroft's statements, which we have found to be, in the main, impartial, and, we suppose, accurate.

From the map published by the Jesuits in Paris, in the year 1660, it appears that their missionaries before this date, "had traced the highway of waters from Lake Erie to Lake Superior, and had gained a glimpse at least of Lake Michigan."[2] As early as 1638, the plan was formed by them to establish missions among the Algonquins both north and south of Lake Huron, in Michigan, and at Green Bay. But their scanty number and incessant labors prevented them from carrying this purpose immediately into execution. Burning with zeal for the salvation of souls for whom Jesus had died, they ardently prayed the Lord that he would send additional laborers into His vineyard. Their prayer was heard; and two years later, (1640) the superiors of the mission were enabled to send Fathers Charles Raymbault and Claude Pijart among the Algonquins of the North and West.[3]

A year later, FF. Raymbault and Jogues were sent to preach among the Chippewas dwelling at Saulte Sainte Marie, in Michigan, the chief of which tribe had humbly sued for missionaries. This mission was painful, but it promised success:

"The chieftains of the Chippewas invited the Jesuits to dwell among them, and hopes were inspired of a permanent mission. A council was held: 'We will embrace you,' said they, 'as brothers; we will derive profit from your words.'"[4] "Thus," the historian says, "did the religious zeal of the French bear the Cross to the banks of the St. Mary and the confines of Lake Superior, and look wistfully towards the homes of the Sioux in the valley of the Missisipi, five years before the New England Elliot had addressed the tribe of Indians that dwelt within six miles of Boston harbor."[5]

The "New England Elliot," should not be mentioned on the same page with the very humblest of the Jesuit missionaries. Did he, or did any other Protestant minister, ever make any *great* sacrifices for the spiritual benefit of the Indians? Did he "leave father and mother, and home and wife," to devote himself, body and soul, for their salvation, amid "Perils of rivers, in perils of robbers, in perils in the wilderness, in labors and painfulness, in watching often, in hunger and thirst, in many fastings, in cold and in nakedness?"[1] Was ever a Protestant minister known to endure all this, or even any considerable portion of it, for the love of Christ, and the conversion of the heathen? All these privations, however, the Jesuits cheerfully endured, and many of them much more besides; for many of them gladly laid down their lives in this cause. The first missionaries among the Hurons,—Fathers Daniel, De Brebeuf, and Lallemant,—all fell glorious martyrs to their devoted zeal. The "New England Elliot" is not known to have penetrated much farther into the Indian wilderness than six miles from Boston harbor; and he did very little, and succeeded very poorly, even when he had reached this amazing distance from home!

---

[1] Vol. iii, P. 128.

[2] Ibid.

[3] P. 129.

[4] P. 132.

[5] P. 131.

23

Father Raymbault soon after fell a victim to the climate, and died of consumption at Quebec. (Oct. 1642) His associate, Father Jogues, who with him had first planted the Cross in Michigan, was reserved for a still more disastrous, though glorious fate. Taken prisoner by the fierce Mohawks, he was carried by them to the vicinity of Albany in New York. His brave companion, the Huron chief Ahasistari, could easily have effected his escape, at the time that the Jesuit was captured: but he came out from his hiding place, and addressing Father Jogues, said: "My brother, I made oath to thee that I would share thy fortune, whether death or life; here I am to keep my vow."[2] He was condemned to the flames; and "having received absolution, he met his end with the enthusiasm of a convert, and the pride of the most gallant war chief of his tribe."[3]

Father Jogues was made to run the gauntlet at three different Mohawk villages: "For days and nights, he was abandoned to hunger and every torment which petulant youth could devise. But yet there was consolation: an ear of Indian corn on the stalk was thrown to the good father, and see! to the broad blade there clung little drops of dew, or of water, enough to baptize two captive neophytes!"[4] He had expected death: but the Mohawks, satisfied perhaps with his sufferings, or awed at his sanctity, spared his life, and his liberty was enlarged:

> "On a hill apart, he carved a long Cross on a tree, and there, in the solitude, meditated the imitation of Christ and soothed his griefs by reflecting that he alone, in that vast region, adored the true God of earth and heaven. Roaming through the stately forests of the Mohawk valley, he wrote the name of Jesus on the bark of trees, engraved the Cross, and entered into possession of these countries, in the name of God,—often lifting up his voice in a solitary chant. Thus did France bring its banner and its faith to the confines of Albany. The missionary himself was humanely ransomed from captivity by the Dutch, and sailing for France, soon returned to Canada."[5]

---

[1] 2 Corinth. xi, 26, 27. [2] P. 133 [3] P. 131. [4] P. 133. [5] P. 134.

> "Similar was the fate of Father Bressani. Taking prisoner while on his way to the Hurons; beaten, mangled, mutilated; driven barefoot over rough paths, through briars and thickets; scourged by a whole village; burned, tortured, wounded, and scarred,—he was eye-witness to the fate of one of his companions, who was boiled and eaten. Yet some mysterious awe protected his life, and he too was at last humanely rescued by the Dutch."[1]

These examples are worthy of the brightest days of the Church, when the Pagans shouted: "The Christians to the lions!"

The charity of Christ urged the missionaries forward, as it had impelled St. Paul of old. Like him, too, "Forgetting the things that were behind, and stretching forth themselves to those which were before, they pursued towards the mark, for the prize of the supernal vocation of God in Christ Jesus."[2] Wherever there was an opportunity to gain a soul to Christ, there the Jesuit apostle was to be found, in spite of snows and frosts, and rugged roads, and apprehensions of savage barbarity. Onward and still onward rolled the sacred tide of missionary enterprise, purifying and regenerating the savage tribes in its course. The missionary never paused in his career: he sought no rest, other than the eternal rest of the saints in heaven.

The Abenakis of Maine had already received the light of the gospel from the Franciscan missionaries, early in the seventeenth century. One of these, Father Viel, had been drowned, (A. D. 1623) by having his frail canoe dashed to pieces, while "shooting a rapid on his way from the Hurons."[3] The Abenakis, touched with the benevolence of Silleri, applied for Jesuit missionaries in the year 1646:

> "In August, Father Gabriel Dreuillettes, first of Europeans, made the long and painful journey from the St. Lawrence to the sources of the Kennebec, and, descending that stream to its mouth in a bark canoe, continued his roamings on an open sea along the coast. A few miles above the mouth of the Kennebec, the Indians in large numbers gathered about him, building a rude chapel. In the winter, he was their companion in their long excursions in quest of game. Who can tell all the hazards that were encountered? The sharp rocks in the channel of the river were full of perils for the frail canoe; winter turned the solitudes into a wilderness of snow; the rover, Christian or Pagan, must carry about with him his house, his furniture, and his food. But the Jesuit succeeded in winning the affections of the savages; and, after a pilgrimage of ten months, an escort of thirty conducted him to Quebec, full of health and joy."[4]

Thus the Jesuits had penetrated the present territory of the United States at three different points: at Sault St. Marie in Michigan, among the Abenakis of Maine, and among the Mohawks around Albany in New York. This last tribe was the fiercest and most indomitable of all. We have already seen how cruelly they treated Father Isaac Jogues, and how wonderfully he escaped from their hands. This good man, having speedily returned to the missions in Canada, soon had an opportunity of requiting evil with good. In May, 1646, he was sent on an embassy to the Mohawks, whose language he had learned while in captivity. He was hospitably received, and he had an interview also with the Onondagas, a neighboring tribe. Elated with joy at his success, on his return to Quebec, he made a report, which inspired the hope and induced the resolution of founding a permanent mission in New York. He was selected as superior of the new mission.

---

[1] Vol. iii, p. 134.
[2] Philippians iii, 13-14.
[3] P 137.
[4] Ibid. p. 136.

On leaving his brethren, he said: *Ibo et non redibo*,—"I will go and will not return." The treacherous Mohawks made him prisoner; "And, against the voice of the other nations, he was condemned by the grand council as an enchanter, who had blighted their harvest. Timid by nature, yet tranquil from zeal, he approached the cabin where the death festival was kept, and, as he entered, received the death blow. His head was hung upon the palisades of the village, his body thrown into the Mohawk river."[1]

The Onondagas and other tribes of New York were more sincere. The death of Father Jogues, far from terrifying his brother missionaries, had contributed rather to influence them with a desire to labor in the same field, and if possible, to share his crown of martyrdom. In 1655, Fathers Chaumonot and Dablon, were sent on this mission:

> "They were hospitably welcomed at Onondaga, the principal village of the tribe. A general convention was held at their desire; and, before the multitudinous assembly of the chiefs and the whole people, gathered under the open sky, among the primeval forests, the presents were delivered; and the Italian Jesuit, with much gesture, after the Italian manner, discoursed so eloquently to the crowd, that it seemed to Dablon as if the word of God had been preached to all the nations of that land. On the next day, the chiefs and others crowded round the Jesuits with their songs of welcome. 'Happy land!' they sang, 'happy land! in which the French are to dwell;' and the chief led the chorus; 'Glad tidings! glad tidings! It is well, that we have spoken together; it is well, that we have a heavenly message.' At once a chapel sprang into existence, and by the zeal of the nation was finished in a day. 'For marbles and precious stones,' writes Dablon, 'we employed only bark; but the path to heaven is as open through a roof of bark, as through arched ceilings of silver and gold.' The savages showed themselves susceptible of the excitements of religious ecstacy; and there, in the heart of New York, the solemn services of the Roman (Catholic) Church, were chanted as securely as in any part of Christendom."[2]

The other tribes of New York also received missionaries, about the same time. Even the fierce Mohawks began to relent, and the Jesuit Le Moyne, "selecting the banks of their river for his abode, resolved to persevere, in the vain hope of infusing into their savage nature the gentler spirit of civilization."[3] The other tribes of the five nations, including the Onondagas just mentioned, proved more tractable:

> "The Cayugas also desired a missionary, and they received the fearless René Mesnard. In their village, a chapel was erected, with mats for the tapestry; and there the pictures of the Saviour, and of the Virgin Mother, were unfolded to the admiring children of the wilderness. The

---

[1] Vol iii, P. 137–8.

[2] Ibid. p, 142.

[3] Ibid.

> Oneidas also listened to the missionary; and, early in 1657, Chaumonot, reached the more fertile and more densely peopled land of the Senecas. * * The Jesuit priests published their faith from the Mohawk to the Genessee, Onondaga remaining the central station."[1]

The missions stretched westward, along Lake Superior, to the waters of the Mississippi. Two young fur traders, having traveled to the west for five hundred leagues, returned in 1656, attended by a number of savages from the Mississippi valley, who eagerly demanded missionaries for their country lying beyond Lake Superior:

> "Their request was eagerly granted; and Gabriel Dreuillettes, the same who carried the Cross through the forests of Maine, and Leonard Gareau, of old a missionary among the Hurons, were selected as the first religious envoys to a land of sacrifices, shadows, and deaths. The canoes are launched; the tawny mariners embark; the oars flash and words of joy and triumph mingle with the last adieus. But just below Montreal, a band of Mohawks, enemies to the Ottowas, awaited the convoy; in the affray, Gareau was mortally wounded and the fleet dispersed."[2]

Undeterred by the sad fate of these first envoys, the Jesuits were still fired with zeal to carry the Cross westward:

> "If the five nations," they said, "can penetrate these regions, to satiate their passion for blood; if mercantile enterprise can bring furs from the plains of the Sioux;— why cannot the Cross be borne to their cabins? * * The zeal of Francis de Laval, the bishop of Quebec, kindled with a desire himself to enter on the mission; but the lot fell to René Mesnard. He was charged to visit Green Bay and Lake Superior, and on a convenient inlet, to establish a residence as a common place of assembly for the surrounding nations. His departure was immediate, (A. D. 1660) and with few preparations; for he trusted — such are his words — 'in the Providence which feeds the little birds of the desert, and clothes the wild flowers of the forests.' Every personal motive seemed to retain him at Quebec; but powerful instincts impelled him to the enterprise. Obedient to his vows, the aged man entered on the path that was red with the blood of his predecessors, and made haste to scatter the seeds of truth through the wilderness, even though the sower cast his seed in weeping. 'In three or four months,' he wrote to a friend, 'you may add me to the *memento* of deaths.'"[3]

His presentiment was verified by the event. After having remained with his neophytes about eight months, the venerable man, "while his attendant was employed in the labor of transporting the canoe, was lost in the forest, and was never more seen. Long afterwards, his cassock and his breviary were kept as amulets among the Sioux."[4]

Similar was the death of the great Father Marquette, the discoverer of the Mississippi;—for want of space compels us reluctantly to pass over the labors of his two illustrious companions, Fathers Allouez and Dablon,[5] as well as our author's graphic account of the brilliant missions among the Chippewas, the Sioux, the Illinois, the Potowatamies, the Sacs and the Foxes.[6] The omission, however, may be, in a great measure, supplied by the reader himself; for what has been said of the other missions, may be repeated, with some modifications, of those just mentioned.

---

[1] Vol. iii, P. 144. [2] P. 146. [3] P. 147.
[4] Ibid. [5] See Bancroft, pp. 149, seq. and 152 seq. [6] P. 150 seq.

We will now give Mr. Bancroft's account of the death of Marquette. In company with the French envoy Joliet, he had discovered and descended the Mississippi to a point beyond the mouth of the Arkansas River. On the 17th of July, 1673, he prepared for his return up the mighty stream. Both in his descent and in his ascent, he had often paused to preach the gospel to the numerous tribes of Indians with whom he happened to meet. On his return, he ascended and explored the Illinois river; and soon arrived at Green Bay, by way of Chicago and Lake Michigan:

> "Joliet returned to Quebec to announce the discovery; * * the unaspiring Marquette remained to preach the gospel to the Miamis, who dwelt in the north of Illinois, round Chicago. Two years afterwards, (A. D. 1675) sailing from Chicago to Mackinaw, he entered a little river in Michigan. Erecting an altar, he said Mass after the rites of the Catholic Church: then, begging the men who conducted his canoe to leave him alone for a half hour,
>
> 'In the darkling wood,
> Amid the cool and silence, he knelt down,
> And offered to the Mightiest solemn thanks
> And supplication'
>
> At the end of the half hour, they went to seek him, and he was no more. The good missionary, discoverer of a new world, had fallen asleep on the margin of the stream that bears his name. Near its mouth, the canoemen dug his grave in the sand. Ever after, the forest rangers, if in danger on Lake Michigan, would invoke his name. The people of the west will build his monument."[1]

Such are some of the leading facts and incidents of the earliest Catholic missions among the Indian tribes of the North West. The reader cannot fail to have admired the self-devotion, the disinterestedness, and the unquenchable zeal of the Jesuits. Their missionary labors on our continent forcibly remind us of the heroic disregard of self manifested by Christian missionaries in the first ages of the Church. Their stupendous success is a conclusive proof, that God was with them, and smiled on their exertions; and also that they preached the true faith. We may triumphantly ask our dissenting brethren, to produce, from the annals of their missionary enterprise, any thing to compare with the picture drawn of the early Jesuit missions by the Protestant historian, Bancroft.

The Jesuit missions of the North West, begun under auspices so favorable, were continued with various vicissitudes, from 1634, to the suppression of the order in 1773,—a period of 139 years. Even after this event, some of the Jesuits still remained with their dear Indians, in the character of secular priests.[2] After the English government had gained possession of Canada, in 1763, the Jesuits were viewed with suspicion, and they would speedily no doubt have been excluded from the Indian missions under British influence, even if Clement XIV. had not thought proper to suppress the order, ten years later. What cared England for the souls of the poor savages? Or what nation or tribe did her influence ever convert or civilize?

---

[1] P 161-2

[2] As, for instance, the one stationed at Kaskaskia.

XVI. EARLY CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN THE NORTH WEST.

SECOND PAPER.—THE HURON MISSION.*

A beautiful spectacle — Reclaiming the savage — Details of the Mission among the Hurons — The nation of Christians — An Indian council — A touching incident — A picture of primitive fervor — Edifying anecdotes — Triumphs of grace — Attack of the Huron villages — Father Daniel — His glorious martyrdom — His virtues — Another attack by the Iroquois — Heroic conduct of Fathers de Brebeuf and Lallemant — They are made prisoners — Devotedness of their neophytes — The glories of the Huron Mission scattered.

In our first Paper, we glanced rapidly at the history of the early Jesuit missions among the Indians of the North West, as given by the American historian Bancroft. In the present, we design to furnish some additional details concerning the mission among the Hurons, the first of all in point of time; having been established, as we have already seen, as early as the year 1634.

The facts which we will give are taken from the old account, or *Relation*, drawn up by Father Paul Ragueneau, the Superior of the mission, and published at Paris in 1650. This document furnishes an interesting account of the state of the mission in the years 1648 and 1649; and it gives a thrilling sketch of the horrors attending the destruction of the Christian villages of St. Joseph and of St. Ignatius, by incursions of the Iroquois,[1] the most deadly enemies of the Hurons and of the Christian name.

It is indeed a beautiful spectacle, to behold Christian civilization blooming amid the frosty wilderness of Canada, and taking deep root and flourishing in the hearts of the wild children of the forest. It does the Christian heart good, to see the fierce and hitherto indomitable savage entirely tamed, and meekly bowing his neck to the sweet yoke of Christ; to behold the devouring wolf converted into the gentle lamb of the fold. The annals of Catholic missions alone can present scenes so sublime and so touching. Philosophy may speculate on its inflated theories of high-sounding benevolence; Protestantism may boast its missionary zeal: but it is only Catholicity which can reclaim the savage, tame his ferocity, and effectually teach him the arts of civilization.

---

* "Relation de ce qui est passé en la Mission des Peres de la Compagnie de Jesus aux Hurons, pais de la Nouvelle France, aux années 1648 et 1649. Par P. Paul Ragueneau, de la mesme Compagnie. A Paris, 1650."

[1] Bancroft calls those who destroyed the mission of St. Joseph MOHAWKS; (vol. iii, p. 138) but the *Relation* styles them IROQUOIS. P. 8.

The missions of Paraguay in South America, and those among the Hurons and other tribes of the North West, contrasted with those which Protestant missionary zeal has *attempted* among the Indians of North America, clearly prove the truth of these remarks. While the latter have proved, in every instance, a complete failure, the former were eminently successful, and plainly bespoke the divine sanction and assistance. It is only the Catholic Church, the faithful spouse of Jesus Christ, "without spot or wrinkle," which can bring forth children for the kingdom of God; the sects, ever since their divorce, have been doomed to barrenness. What savage tribe, in fact, have Protestant missionaries ever succeeded in converting or civilizing? On the contrary, we have already seen, on the authority of the Protestant historian Bancroft, what was effected in this way by the Jesuit missionaries in North America. And his statement, honorable as it is to the zeal and labors of the Jesuits, is still very meagre indeed, when compared with the detailed accounts furnished by those who were actors in the scenes which he so summarily describes. This will sufficiently appear from the facts embodied in the present paper.

Fathers Anthony Daniel and John de Brebeuf were the first missionaries sent among the Hurons, in the year 1634. We have already seen how much they suffered on the long journey of nine hundred miles, from Quebec[1] to the Huron wilderness. After having labored with untiring zeal, and amidst sufferings and privations of the most appalling character, for the space of about fifteen years, they both sealed their mission with their blood. The first missionaries to the Hurons, they were also the first martyrs. Their blood, however, far from quenching missionary zeal, was, on the contrary, a fertile seed, scattered on the face of the wilderness, from which new champions sprang forth, panting for the crown of martyrdom. The same heroic spirit which had led Christians to smile on death in the days of Tertullian, at the close of the second century, was manifested by the faithful children of the Catholic Church laboring amid the snows of the Huron wilderness, in the middle of the seventeenth. The power of God was not abridged, nor was his right arm shortened.

These two venerable pioneers of the Indian missions soon beheld themselves surrounded by a large body of zealous companions, equally devoted, in life and in death, to the good cause. Four new missionaries having arrived in September 1648, the total number laboring in the Huron mission then amounted to eighteen. These were dispersed through eleven different stations, eight of which were for the tribes who spoke the Huron tongue, and the three others were among the Algonquins.[2] The four newly arrived apostles were given as assistants to those whose districts were the most extensive; the greater portion of the missionaries had no companions, save "the tutelary angels of the tribes" among which they labored.[1] The condition of the mission is thus described by Father Ragueneau:

---

[1] Called KEBEC in the oldest writings, and in the *Relation* of 1648--1649.

[2] Relation, p. 18.

> "Everywhere the progress of the faith has far surpassed our hopes; the greater portion of the savages, even those who had been before the most ferocious, having become so docile and so pliable to the preaching of the Gospel, as to make it manifest that the angels labored more among them than ourselves. The number of those who received baptism during the past year (1648) is about eighteen hundred; without reckoning a vast multitude baptized by Father Anthony Daniel, on the day of the capture of St. Joseph's, of whom we have not been able to take any exact account; and not comprising those baptized by Fathers John de Brebeuf and Gabriel Lallemant at the capture of the villages forming the mission of St. Ignatius. . . . It is enough for us that heaven hath kept a good account of these, for, in sooth, these baptisms have served but to enrich the Church triumphant." [2]

The *Relation* then proceeds to state, that no intelligence had yet been received from a mission established eight months before among a tribe of the Algonquins, dwelling on an island sixty leagues to the west. The missionary who was stationed at this distant post, far away from his brethren, had much to endure, and had already no doubt gained many souls to Jesus Christ. This island, situated amidst the waters of Lake Huron, was called by the Indians *Ekaentoton;* but the Jesuits named it *St. Mary's.*[3]

Wherever a mission was organized, there a flourishing Christian village, and sometimes a cluster of them, sprang up amidst the frowning wilderness. The Jesuit missionary was the father of each little Christian community. He lived with his spiritual children, adopted their mode of life, shared their privations, rejoiced with them when they rejoiced, and wept with them when they wept. He became "all to all, to gain all to Christ." The affections of the Indians were thus won, their hearts were enchained; they became as docile as little children in the hands of the missionaries, and they renewed in their lives the brilliant examples of virtue set by the primitive Christians.

The mission of the Conception, of which the principal station was at St. Mary's, was the oldest of those established among the Hurons. It was the one, too, which set the brightest example of every virtue, and shone as a brilliant luminary in the midst of the wilderness, presenting a model for the imitation of the neighboring tribes. Says the *Relation:*

> "Men, women, and children, made so open a profession of what they all wished to be even unto death, that the surrounding tribes were wont to call them by no other name, than *the Nation of Christians.* In effect, their chiefs are so ardent in maintaining the faith, and all the families have submitted to its teachings so generally, that, but very few infidels remaining among them, the Christians are no longer willing to tolerate any of their ancient customs, which were the remains of infidelity, or which were injurious to morals. In the beginning of the winter (1648–9) these good neophytes convened a general council, to confer together on the best means for strengthening the faith among them. They came to the conclusion to

---

[1] Relation, p. 8.

[2] Ibid. p. 18–19.

[3] Ibid. p. 20.

seek out the Father who has charge of the mission, and to beg him to retrench from their customs whatever was contrary to the faith, and to correct, in thóse uses which were indifferent, whatever might prove in any wise dangerous; and they pledged themselves to obey him in every thing, to view him as the bearer of the word of God, and as their first Chief. The best of it is, that they keep their word, and that, on the least doubt which subsequently arose on this subject, their chiefs came themselves to the Father to receive and execute his orders."[1]

Towards the close of the winter, this good resolution was put to the test. Some obstinate infidels among the Hurons, wishing to revive their ancient sorceries and impure remedies for healing the sick, called in some chiefs from the neighboring infidel tribes to aid them with their influence; but these found the faith of the neophytes proof against all their efforts to shake it, and they were compelled to desist from this attempt.[2] The following incident, which we abridge from the *Relation*,[3] will serve to show how unshaken was the constancy of those Huron Christians.

In one of the public games practised among the Hurons, it was customary for the war-chief to enter the cabins of the village in a kind of fury, and with uplifted tomahawk to destroy the doors and rude furniture, as if attacking an enemy's camp. In one of these fits of assumed rage, an infidel chief of great credit in the tribe declared that he had been admonished in a dream to break open the door of the church, and to cut down the tree from the branches of which was hung the bell which called the Christians to morning and evening service. On any other occasion, it would have been deemed an offense against the national usages to thwart the infuriate chief in his purpose; but the menace against the church aroused the zeal of a venerable octogenarian who had embraced the Christian faith. He fell on his knees, and having made a short prayer, he rushed to the church door, just as the savage chief was raising his tomahawk to demolish its portals; placed his bald head before the upraised weapon, and exclaimed: "The stroke of the tomahawk would fall much better upon my head, than upon a house consecrated to God!" The infidel was lost in amazement: "Strike," said the Christian, "I promise publicly that no vengeance shall be taken for my death; neither the public nor he who will have dealt me the death-stroke, shall inflict or suffer any penalty for it: but I cannot see with my eyes, that either the sanctity of the house dedicated to the service of God should be profaned, or that the voice which summons us to prayer should be hushed!" The infidel chief was abashed, and he desisted from his purpose.

Examples so heroic could not but exercise a powerful influence on the neighboring tribes. The good Father Ragueneau expresses the delight with which his soul overflowed in the following passage:

"Without doubt the angels of heaven have been rejoiced at seeing, that in all the villages of this country the faith is respected, and that Christians now glory in that name which was in reproach but a few years ago. For my part, I could never have hoped to see, even after fifty years of labor, one tenth part of the piety, of the virtue and sanctity, of which I have been an eye-witness in the visits made to those churches, which have but lately grown up in the bosom of infidelity. It has given me a sensible delight to witness the diligence of Christians, who anticipated the light of the sun to come to the public prayers; and who, though harassed with toil, came again in immense throngs before night to render anew their homages to God: to see the little children emulating the piety of their parents, and accustoming themselves, from the most tender age, to offer up to God their little sufferings, griefs, and labors. Often little girls, while engaged in gathering wood for the fire in the adjoining forests, can find no employment more agreeable than to recite the Rosary, seeking to outstrip one another in this exercise of piety. But what has charmed me most, is to see that the sentiments of faith have penetrated so deeply into the hearts of those whom we but lately called barbarians, — and I can say it with entire truth — that divine grace has destroyed, in most of them, the fears, the desires, and the joys inspired heretofore by the feelings of nature."[1]

---

[1] Relation, p. 20-21. [2] Ibid. p. 23. [3] Ibid. p. 22-24.

The following touching anecdotes will serve still further to illustrate this triumph of divine grace. We condense them from the *Relation:*[2]

"A small child six years old fell dangerously sick in the mission of St. Michael. His mother, seeing the excess of his sufferings, and the approaches of death to her dearly beloved and only child, could not restrain her tears. 'My mother,' exclaimed the child, 'why do you weep? Your tears will not restore me to health; rather let us pray God together, that He would make me happy in heaven.' After some prayers, the mother said: 'My son, I must carry you to St. Mary's, that the French Fathers may restore you to health.' 'Alas! my mother,' rejoined the little innocent, 'I have a fire which burns in my head,—can they extinguish it? I dream no longer of life; have no more solicitude for me; but I will admonish you of my approaching end, and I will then beg you to carry me to St. Mary's, for I wish to die there, and to be buried among the good Christians.'"

Some days afterwards, the child admonished the mother that it was time to carry him to St. Mary's, as his end was approaching. It was a custom of the tribe, that when one was on the eve of death, a multitude assembled to perform the superstitious ceremonies of the country. When the child beheld the gathering throng, he exclaimed: "Alas! my mother; would you have me sin on the very eve of death? No, I renounce all these superstitions; I wish to die like a good Christian." The *Relation* closes the account with these words:

"This little angel was brought to us, and died in our arms, praying until death, and assuring us that he was going straight to heaven, where he would pray to God for us; and he even asked his mother to inform him, for which of his relations he should pray most, when he would be with God, and when his prayers would without doubt be heard. He *was* heard; for shortly after his death, one of his uncles who had been among those who had been the most rebellious to the faith in this whole country, as well as one of his aunts, demanded instruction at our hands, and became Christians."

Similar to this is another incident of a little girl of five years, who having attended morning and evening prayers with great assiduity, and having persevered in this even against the prohibition of her parents, was permitted to receive baptism. Some time afterwards she was taken dangerously ill. Her infidel parents summoned a medicine man, or juggler, to her bedside, and he began his incantations. The little girl, though very low, had yet strength enough to protest against the superstitious rites. She said: "I am a Christian; the devils have no longer power over me; I do not consent to the sin which you are commiting in consulting the evil one; I wish no such remedies; God alone will heal me." The parents, awed by this appeal, compelled the juggler to retire. The child on the same day begged to be carried to the church, assuring the bystanders that she would be healed, which in fact took place. Her parents were converted and demanded baptism.

---

[1] Relation, p, 24, 25.

[2] Ibid p. 26, seq.

The *Relation* gives also a touching account of a girl of fifteen, who had been taken prisoner late in the previous winter (1647–8) by a hostile tribe. Though imbued with the faith, she had not yet received baptism. While weeping in her captivity, she fervently prayed that God would preserve her purity, which was greatly endangered, and that he would grant her the grace to return to the station of St. Mary's, in order that she might receive baptism. Her prayer was heard; she felt a full assurance that her deliverance was at hand; she threw herself into the first path with which she met, and, without guide other than her guardian angel, without provisions, without protection, she traveled on foot a rugged journey of 240 miles, and arrived in safety at St. Mary's, where she received the long sighed for grace of baptism, and became a model of virtue to the neophytes. The *Relation* concludes this branch of the subject as follows:

> "This chapter would be endless, were I to recount all the triumphs of grace among these poor savages, which excite our admiration more and more every day, and for which we will bless God forever in heaven, without lassitude or disgust. I cannot, however, omit to mention a sentiment almost universal among a multitude of good Christians, who having lost all their property, their children, and whatever they held dear in this world, and being on the point of abandoning their country to escape the cruelty of the Iroquois, their enemies, yet thank God and say: 'My God! be thou blessed forever! I cannot regret these losses, since faith has taught me that the love which Thou bearest towards Christians is not for the goods of this earth, but for those of eternity; I bless Thee in the midst of my losses as cheerfully as I ever did before; Thou art my Father, and it is enough for me to know that Thou lovest me, to make me content with all the evils which may happen.' But what astonishes me most in all this, is to behold that these sentiments do not come in tardily, after nature and passion have swayed the first motions of the heart; but that grace often anticipates and controls even those first sallies, directing them to heaven more promptly than to earth. May God be blessed forever for all this!"[1]

Such was the happy condition of the Huron missions, which thus rivaled those of Paraguay in South America, though on a more reduced scale. The snow-clad wilderness of the North produced as lovely fruits for heaven, as did the sunny climes of the South; and the same skillful hands cultivated both portions of the vineyard. Nor does the parallel stop here. Both missions were broken up by violence, when at the very height of their prosperity: that of Paraguay by the heartless policy of the Portuguese court under the administration of the ever infamous Pombal; and that of the Hurons, by instruments scarcely more fierce—the implacable Iroquois. God permitted both catastrophes, in the mysterious and unsearchable ways of His providence; and both peopled heaven with martyrs from among the Indian tribes.

---

[1] Relation, p. 82, 83.

The Iroquois fell upon the Huron wigwams at two different times: first, on the 4th of July, 1648, when they destroyed the two flourishing frontier Christian villages composing the mission of St. Joseph; and secondly, on the 16th of March, 1649, when a thousand hostile savages massacred the inhabitants, and scattered the glories of the mission of St. Ignatius. In the former invasion, Father Anthony Daniel fell, the proto-martyr of the Jesuits in North America, as he had been one of the first pioneers of the Huron mission; in the latter, Father John de Brebeuf and Gabriel Lallemant, laid down their lives for the faith, amidst the most excruciating tortures. We will glance rapidly at the history of both these melancholy occurrences, condensing the very detailed account of them given in the *Relation* already quoted.

The principal village of the two which composed the mission of St. Joseph, numbered about four hundred families. Almost all the men were absent on the chase, or on a warlike expedition. Father Daniel, who had charge of the mission, was just finishing Mass, and the Christians according to custom had filled the church about sunrise, when the alarm was given, and the cry "To arms" resounded through the village. The Iroquois had stolen upon the town unperceived during the night, and they now burst with their fierce war-whoops upon the inhabitants, thus taken by surprise and unprepared for defense. "Some flew to the combat, others fled panic-stricken; Father Daniel throwing himself hastily among the thickest of the combatants, where the peril was greatest, encouraged his neophytes to make a noble defense; and . . he spoke in a tone so animated, as to make a deep impression on those hearts which had hitherto proved most rebellious, and to impart to them a Christian spirit." The crowd of applicants for baptism proved so great, that the Father was constrained by the emergency to steep his handkerchief in water, and to baptize the multitude by aspersion. The combat waxed warmer and warmer; a multitude of Christians just baptized exchanged an earthly robe of innocence for a heavenly garment of glory: the Hurons were overpowered by superior numbers, and the Iroquois became masters of the place. Father Daniel was entreated to fly, and he could easily have effected his escape. But he recollected that many infirm and old persons had been previously prepared for baptism; he hastily flew around the cabins of the village, baptizing these, and a multitude of infants; and, finding the houses already in flames, he betook himself to the church, wishing to die there near the altar of God. He found it already full of Christians, or of catechumens who eagerly demanded baptism. He baptized some, gave absolution to others, and exclaimed to the assembled multitude: "My brethren, we shall to-day be together in heaven!"[1]

The Iroquois surround the church with a horrible outcry. Father Daniel cries out, at the top of his voice: "Fly, my brethren, fly! and bear with you your faith even to the last breath! For my part, I must die here, and here abide, so long as I shall see a soul to gain for heaven; and dying to save you, my life is to me as nothing:—we shall meet again in heaven!" Meantime, while his neophytes are flying in all directions; this good shepherd goes forth to meet the enemy: the fierce war shout is hushed: rage is succeeded by a moment of awful silence; the appearance of the man, his earnest manner, his face all radiant with the light of heaven, had stricken awe into every savage bosom. Rallying, however, after a moment's hesitancy, they rush upon him with savage cries; a hundred arrows pierce him, and a musket ball enters his body passing near the heart. Father Daniel falls dead: the shepherd has given his life for his flock, with the divine assurance of finding it anew in heaven.

Finding that he had fallen, the savages rushed upon him, tore off his clothing and mangled his body, treating it with every indignity. At length, the church being already in flames, his body was cast into the fire, and the good Father's sacrifice became a holocaust. He and his beloved church were consumed in the same flames. He had, by striking awe into the savages and riveting their attention on himself, contributed to save the lives of many of his flock, who were thus enabled to escape.

Thus died Anthony Daniel, the proto-martyr of North America. A native of Dieppe in France, born of wealthy and respectable parents, he had entered at an early age into the society of the Jesuits. Chosen for the Huron mission, he had labored among these people for fourteen years, indefatigable in his zeal, and panting daily for the crown of martyrdom. He was remarkable "for heroic courage, untiring patience, unalterable meekness, and a charity which could excuse all things, bear with all things, and love every body. His humility was sincere, his obedience entire, and he was always ready to do everything and to suffer everything. His zeal animated him even unto death, which though sudden, was not unexpected. For he always carried his life in his hands; and during the nine years that he had been employed in the frontier Christian villages, on a mission which was most exposed to the enemy, he had sighed, with hope and with love, for that death which finally fell to his lot."[2]

But two days before his glorious death, he had finished a spiritual retreat at the house of St. Mary's, and had made a general confession with a view to prepare himself for eternity. Inflamed with renewed zeal, he would not consent to remain even for a day with his brethren to enjoy a brief repose, but hastened back to his mission, having a sort of instinctive feeling that he was needed there. On the 3rd of July, he preached his last sermon to his dear neophytes, bidding them, with tears in his eyes, to prepare for death; on the 4th, he fell a martyr, as we have seen. In the words of the *Relation*: "He left after him an example of every virtue; the savages, even those who were infidels, cherished so strong an attachment for his memory, as to allow us to say with truth, that he had charmed the hearts of all who had ever known him."[1]

---

[1] Relation, p. 10-11

[2] Relation, p. 12.

We must now turn to another scene of horror and carnage, more dreadful far than the one we have just attempted feebly to describe. Encouraged by their former success, the Iroquois returned early in the spring of the following year — 1649; and on the 16th of March, a thousand warriors attacked the Christian village of St. Ignatius at break of day, while the inhabitants were all buried in sleep. They carried the place by assault, put men, women and children to death, and set fire to the cabins. Out of four hundred inhabitants, but three escaped over the snow to carry the alarm to the village of St. Louis, but a league distant! The Iroquois followed up their success, and before sunrise surrounded this village, which was fortified with a strong pine palisade. At their approach, many of the women and children fled to the neighboring towns. About eighty valiant Hurons resolved to defend the place to the last extremity. A desperate conflict ensued; but after thirty of the invaders had been killed, and a great number wounded, the palisades were forced, and the enemy rushed in, overpowering their feeble adversaries, and carrying everything before them. Being well provided with fire arms, which they had obtained from their neighbors, the Dutch in New York, they were an overmatch for the Hurons, whom they now butchered almost without resistance. They set fire to the town, and cast into the flames the old, the infirm, the wounded, and such small children as had not been able to effect their escape. From the central missionary station of St. Mary's, but a league distant, the flames were discovered at nine o'clock in the morning; and the sad forebodings of the good Fathers who dwelt there were soon confirmed by a messenger who had escaped from the massacre.[2]

In the village of St. Louis there resided at the time of the assault two Jesuit Fathers, John de Brebeuf and Gabriel Lallemant, who had charge of this, and of four other neighboring villages, which formed but one of the eleven Huron and Algonquin missions before spoken of:

> "Some of the Christians had entreated the Fathers to preserve their lives for the glory of God, which could have been very easily effected, since at the first alarm more than five hundred had escaped with ease to a place of security; but their zeal would not allow them to do this, and the salvation of their flock was dearer to them than the love of life. They employed every moment of their time, as the most precious of their whole

---

[1] Relation, p. 14.

[2] Ibid. p. 35-6.

lives; and during the hottest of the combat, their heart was all on fire for the salvation of souls. One of them was at the breach baptizing the catechumens; the other was giving absolution to the neophytes; and both were busy in animating the Christians to die in sentiments of piety, which consoled them in the midst of their misfortunes. . . An unconverted Huron seeing things desperate, spoke of flight: but a Christian, named Stephen Annaotaha, the most distinguished of the whole village for his courage and for his exploits against the enemy, would not hear of it. 'What?' he exclaimed, 'shall we abandon these good Fathers, who for our sakes have exposed their own lives? The love they have for our salvation will be the cause of their death; there is no longer time for them to fly across the snows. Let us then die with them, and in their company we will go to heaven.' This chief had made a general confession but a few days before, having had a presentiment of the threatened danger, and having said that he wished death to find him ripe for heaven. And in effect, both he and many other Christians displayed so much fervor, that we can never sufficiently bless the ways of God towards His elect, whom His providence watches over with love at every moment, in life and in death. This whole multitude of Christians fell, for the most part, alive into the hands of the enemy, and with them our two Fathers, the pastors of that church. They were not killed immediately; God reserved for them more glorious crowns."[1]

Having taken the two villages of St. Ignatius and St. Louis in one day, the Iroquois dispatched couriers on the same evening to reconnoiter that of St. Mary's. The council of warriors resolved to attack it the next morning, the 17th of March; but on their march, an advanced detachment of two hundred Iroquois were met by a body of Hurons who had sallied from the village of St. Mary's; and, after a severe struggle, the former were forced to retreat, and were pursued till they took shelter within the paliside of the destroyed village of St. Louis. Here the Hurons succeeded in killing many and in making thirty prisoners. Meantime the main body of the Iroquois, having heard of the discomfiture of their brethren, came upon the Hurons in the midst of their victory. Long and fiercely raged the battle within and near the palisade of St. Louis; but at length, after the conflict had been protracted till late in the night, the Iroquois were again victorious, all the Hurons having been either killed or wounded. But the victory was dearly bought: a hundred Iroquois were among the slain, and their head chief was dangerously wounded.[2]

During the whole night of the 17th, the French at St. Mary's were under arms, hourly expecting an assault. The Jesuit Fathers were engaged in fervent prayer prostrate before the altar. "We considered ourselves," they say in the *Relation*, "as so many victims consecrated to our Lord, who ought to await patiently the hour when we shall be immolated for His glory, without seeking either to retard or to hasten it."[3] A profound silence prevailed during the whole day of the 18th, which was spent by the Christians in prayer, and by the Iroquois in consultation. On the morning of the 19th, the feast of the great St. Joseph, chief patron of the mission, a sudden panic seized upon the enemy, who fled precipitately, carrying with them such of their prisoners as were able to travel, and as they had not doomed to immediate death. The dreadful fate of the wounded and of other prisoners, is thus graphically described in the *Relation:*

---

[1] Relation, p. 37.

[2] Ibid. p. 40, 41.

[3] Ibid. p. 42.

> "As for the other prisoners whom they had doomed to immediate death, they bound them to pine stakes driven into the earth in the different cabins, to which, in leaving the village, they set fire on all sides: taking delight on their departure at the piteous cries of these poor victims perishing in the midst of the flames,—of infants roasted by the side of their mothers, and of husbands who saw their wifes roasted near them."[1]

Thus were scattered the earthly glories of the Huron missions! Thus did many of the Huron Christians pass from an earthly to a heavenly habitation. Happy exchange! Heaven peopled from among the wild red men of the wilderness! Here truly were exhibited scenes worthy of the primitive Church!

The consequences of the two hostile invasions described above, and the apprehension of similar attacks in future, caused the abandonment of fifteen of the Huron villages;[2] the Christians of which were scattered among the neighboring tribes, bearing with them only their faith and their virtues. The Iroquois had robbed them of all else. To increase the calamity, a dreadful famine came on, and the condition of the Hurons who had survived the massacre became deplorable in the extreme.[3] The Jesuits wept and suffered with them, cheering their drooping spirits with bright visions of paradise. In the midst of all their sufferings, the good Fathers rejoiced at the visible triumphs of grace in the lives of their dear neophytes, to whom they clung in life and in death.

At first the missionaries had intended to emigrate westward with the remnant of the Hurons, to the distant Island of Ekaentoton or St. Mary's; but the Huron chiefs being averse to removing so far from the bones of their deceased relatives, and having in an eloquent speech of three hours implored the Fathers to make the neighboring Island of St. Joseph's their central mission, their request was granted, and the purpose of moving farther west was postponed for a time.[4]

In our next paper we will conclude this interesting subject of the Huron missions; and will present a rapid sketch of the edifying life and glorious death of the great Apostle of the Hurons—the Xavier of North America—JOHN DE BREBEUF.

---

[1] Relation, p. 48. [2] Ibid. p. 86-7. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid, p. 92, seq.

XVII. EARLY CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN THE NORTH WEST.

THIRD PAPER. — FATHERS DE BREBEUF AND LALLEMANT.*

Martyrdom of Fathers de Brebeuf and Lallemant — Their remains solemnly interred — Their heroism — Details of their martyrdom — Horrible cruelties — Life of Father Lallemant — His reasons for devoting himself to the Indian missions — The Aloysius of the Huron missions — And the Xavier — Father John de Brebeuf — Sketch of his life — His first attempt to found the Huron Mission — His ardent seal — And spirit of prayer — His love of the cross — He pants for martyrdom — His difficulties and sufferings among the Hurons — He is exposed to imminent danger of his life — His humility — His unceasing labors — His calmness — And noble courage — The results of his seal — The Apostle of the Hurons.

In our second Paper we endeavored to draw a rapid sketch of the rise, progress, and disasters of the Huron missions. In the present, we will attempt a biographical notice of the two Fathers, John de Brebeuf and Gabriel Lallemant, whom we left captives in the hands of the implacable Iroquois. And in order to resume the thread of the narrative, we will first speak of their glorious death, or rather martyrdom, — for they voluntarily gave their lives for the love of Christ and the salvation of the neighbor; — and then, we will furnish a summary account of the life and labors of each.[1]

On the morning after the flight of the Iroquois, the Jesuit Fathers at St. Mary's having, through some Huron captives who had escaped, received intelligence of the death of Fathers de Brebeuf and Lallemant, sent one of their number, with seven Frenchmen as an escort, to find and bring back their mortal remains. The messengers, on reaching the spot where the martyrdom of these illustrious missionaries had been consummated, witnessed a scene which froze their very souls with horror. Every thing betokened the fiendish barbarity of the merciless Iroquois. Having reverently gathered up the mangled remains of the two Fathers, they brought them back to the mission of St. Mary's, where they were solemnly interred on the 21st of March, which fell on a Sunday. At the funeral, all were "filled with so much consolation and with sentiments of a devotion so tender, that every one ardently desired, rather than feared, a similar death; and that all would have deemed themselves thrice happy, to have obtained from God the grace of shedding their blood and laying down their lives under similar circumstances. No one could bring himself to pray to God for their repose, as if they stood in need of prayer; but all raised their hearts to heaven, where they had no doubt the souls of the departed already were."[1]

---

* "Relation de ce qui est passé en la Mission des Peres de la compagnie de Jesus aux Hurons, pais de la Nouvelle France, aux années 1648 et 1649. Par P. Paul Ragueneau, de la mesme Compagnie. A Paris, 1650."

[1] The *Relation* devotes two whole Chapters to this part of the subject; from p. 44 to p. 86.

From the narrative of some fugitive Huron captives, who had been eye-witnesses of all the circumstances attending their death, the following details are gathered. Immediately after their capture, they were both stripped of their clothing, had their finger nails torn out by the roots, and were borne in savage triumph to the village of St. Ignatius, which had been taken on the same morning. On entering its gates, they both received a shower of blows on their shoulders, loins and stomach,—no part of their exposed bodies escaping contumely. Father de Brebeuf, though almost sinking under these cruel blows, and fainting from agony and loss of blood, still lost not courage; but, his eye kindling with fire, he addressed the Christian Hurons who were his fellow captives, in the following language:

> "My children! Let us lift our eyes to heaven in the midst of our sufferings; let us remember that God is a witness of our torments, and that He will soon be our reward exceedingly great. Let us die in this faith, and trust in His goodness for the fulfillment of His promises. I feel more for you than for myself: but bear with courage the few torments which yet remain; they will all terminate with our lives: the glory which will follow them will have no end! Echon,"[2] they replied, "our hope shall be in heaven, while our bodies are suffering on earth. Pray to God for us, that He would grant us mercy: we will invoke Him even unto death."[3]

Some infidel Hurons, who had proved obstinate under the preaching of the missionaries, and who, having been long before taken captive by the Iroquois, had become naturalized among them, were filled with fiendish rage at the noble freedom with which the captive Father spoke. They rushed upon him and Father Lallemant, they cut off the hands of one, transpierced the body of the other with pointed reeds and iron arrow-points; they applied red-hot tomahawks under their armpits and over their loins; they put a collar around their necks from which were suspended red-hot tomahawks, so that, whether they stood erect, or bent on either side, their bodies were deeply burnt with the heated iron: in fine they bound round their bodies girdles of bark covered with pitch and rosin, to which they set fire. Thus were the good Jesuits roasted with more cruelty, than had been even St. Lawrence on his gridiron! Let us now hear the *Relation:*

> "In the midst of his torments, Father Gabriel Lallemant raised his eyes to heaven, joining his hands from time to time, and sending forth sighs to God whom he invoked to his succor. Father John de Brebeuf, with the apparent insensibility of a rock, heedless alike of fire and flame, continued in profound silence, without once venting a sigh or a murmur, which astonished even his executioners: without doubt his heart was then sweetly reposing in the bosom of God! After a brief space, as if returning to himself he preached to those infidels, and more especially to a number of good Christian captives, who showed compassion for his

---

[1] Relation, p. 52-3.

[2] The Huron name of Father de Brebeuf.

[3] Relation pp. 46-7.

sufferings. His cruel executioners, indignant at his zeal, in order to prevent his speaking any more of God, struck him on the mouth, cut off his nose, and tore away his lips; but his blood spoke more eloquently than his lips, and his heart not having yet been torn out, his tongue did not fail to aid him in recounting the mercies of God in the midst of his torments, and in animating more than ever his Christian fellow captives. In derision of baptism, which these good Fathers had so charitably administered at the breach and in the hottest of the contest, those barbarious enemies of the faith bethought themselves of baptizing them with boiling water. More than twice or thrice their whole body was inundated with the scalding element, the infidels accompanying the ablution with heartless jeers: — 'We baptize you, that you may be happy in heaven; for without baptism no one can be saved?' Others said, mocking: 'We treat you as friends, for we will be the cause of your greater happiness in heaven: thank us for our good offices, for the more you suffer, the more God will reward you.'[1]

"The more their torments were redoubled, the more did the Fathers pray, that their sins might not be the cause of the reprobation of these blinded infidels, whom they forgave with all their hearts. . . . When they were attached to the stakes where they endured all these tortures, and where they were to die, they fell on their knees, embraced the wood with joy, and kissed it fervently as the cherished object of their sighs and prayers, and as a certain and last pledge of their eternal salvation. They continued in prayer much longer than pleased their barbarous tormentors. These plucked out the eyes of Father Gabriel Lallemant, and applied red-hot coals to the orifices from which they had been torn. Their sufferings did not take place at the same time. Father John de Brebeuf suffered for about three hours, and expired at 4 o'clock in the evening of the 16th of March, the same day on which the village of St. Ignatius had been captured. Father Gabriel Lallemant suffered much longer: from six o'clock of that evening, until about nine o'clock of the following day, the 17th of March. Before their death the hearts of both were torn out, an incision having been made for this purpose under the breast; and those barbarians drank their blood while it was still warm . . . While they were yet living, pieces of flesh were cut off from their thighs, arms, and legs, which were roasted and eaten before their eyes! Their bodies had been gashed all over, and, to increase their torments, red-hot tomahawks were run along the deep incisions. Father John de Brebeuf had been already scalped; his feet had been cut off, and his thighs denuded to the very bone, and one of his cheeks had been divided by a stroke of the tomahawk. Father Gabriel Lallemant had also received a stroke of the murderous weapon on his left ear, and the instrument had sunk deep into his skull, laying bare the brain: we could find no part of his body, from the head to the foot, which had not been roasted, even while he was living. Their very tongues were roasted, burning fire-brands and bunches of bark having been repeatedly thrust into their mouths, to prevent them from invoking, while dying, the name and succor of Him, for whose love they were enduring all these torments."[2]

But we sicken at these accumulated horrors: we will drop the veil over them, and with it, a tear over the horrible blindness and perverseness of human nature when left to its own impulses, without the light of grace, and the softening influence of Christian civilization. We will now endeavor to draw a rapid sketch of the lives of the two remarkable men, whose glorious martyrdom we have described.

---

[1] Relation, p. 48

[2] Ibid, p. 50-51.

Father Lallemant was in his 39th year, and he had been but six months engaged in the Indian missions; yet was he destined to bear off one of the first crowns. For several years he had begged with tears in his eyes to be sent on this mission, notwithstanding that his constitution was very weak and his health extremely delicate. He could hope to have little other bodily strength, than that which the grace of God might impart. In a writing[1] which he drew at the desire of his superiors, assigning the reasons why he petitioned to be sent on the Indian mission, are found the following edifying passages:

"I wish to labor on those missions: 1st, to discharge the obligations which I owe to Thee, O my God! For if Thou hast abandoned pleasure, honors, health, joy, and life itself, to save me a miserable sinner, is it more than reasonable that I should abandon all things after Thy example, for the salvation of those whom Thou esteemest Thine, who have cost Thee Thy blood, whom Thou hast loved even unto death, and of whom Thou hast said: "Whatever you have done to one of these least ones, you have done it to me?' . . . 2. Since I have been so miserable as to have offended Thy goodness, O my Jesus! Is it not just that I should atone for my sins by extraordinary sufferings; and thus should walk before Thy face, all the rest of my life, with a contrite and humble heart in the midst of sufferings, which thou didst first endure for me. 3d. I am indebted to my relations, to my mother and to my brothers, and I ought to draw down upon them the effects of Thy mercy. My God, permit not that any one of this family, for which Thou hast shown so much love, should ever be lost in Thy sight, or should ever belong to the number of those who will blaspheme Thee eternally. Let me be a victim for them; 'for I am prepared for stripes, — here burn, here cut, that thou mayst spare eternally.' 4. Yes, my Jesus! and my love! Thy blood, which was shed also for the barbarians, should be efficaciously applied to their salvation, and it is for this reason, that I wish to co-operate with Thy grace, and to be immolated for them."[2]

Having left the world at a tender age, and abandoned the prospects of worldly promotion which were open to his wealthy and respectable family, he seems to have preserved unsullied his baptismal innocence. Having become a Jesuit, he walked so uprightly before God, as everywhere to diffuse around him the sweet odor of Christ. Diffident by nature, and timid in conscience, he carefully fled from even the shadow of sin; yet he was ever calm, and he did not indulge in scruples. In France he had gone through a regular course of studies with great success, and he was a proficient in the languages and the sciences. During the few months that he labored among the Hurons, he became a little child with them, selecting the lowliest of them for his teachers in the difficult Huron language, in which he had already made great proficiency. Born to honor and distinction, he loved only the Cross, and he clung to the Cross even unto death. Revered as the angel of the Huron mission, he was wholly unconscious of his own merits, and looked on himself as the last of his brethren. Mr. Bancroft appropriately styles him: "the gentle Lallemant." He was born at Paris, on the 31st of October, 1610; and he died a martyr at the stake, on the 17th of March, 1649, in the 39th year of his age. Truly his prayer was heard: he "was immolated for the poor Indians!" Only Catholicity can point to examples so bright and so heroic!

---

[1] Found after his death, among his papers.

[2] Relation, p. 54-5

If Father Lallemant was the Aloysius of the Huron mission, Father John de Brebeuf was its Xavier. The former was a lamb; the latter a lion: yet each had many qualities distinctive of the other; and the lion and the lamb were immolated together, for the love of God and of the neighbor. Yet did the lamb die much more slowly than the lion!

Father John de Brebeuf was sent from France on the Canadian mission in the year 1625 by Father Peter Caton, whose discrimination had marked him out as a suitable instrument for converting the savage tribes of New France. As a kind of apprenticeship to his future labors, he spent the winter of 1625–6, wandering in the woods and mountains among the savages in the neighborhood of Quebec. During this time, it is impossible to tell how much he suffered: hunger, thirst, and cold, were the constant attendants of the wild savage life. In the spring of 1626, he penetrated into the Huron wilderness, alone and on foot; the first white man perhaps, certainly the first missionary, who ever entered its unexplored recesses. He soon mastered the difficult Huron dialect, adapted himself in all things to the manners and habits of the Huron tribe, and succeeded so well in making himself "all to all, in order to gain all to Jesus Christ," that he became the idol of the savages.[1]

In 1629, the English gained a temporary possession of Canada; and, with the anti-religious policy which has almost invariably marked that rapacious government, the Jesuits were forbidden any longer to prosecute their missions among the Indians. The Huron mission, commenced under auspices so favorable, was thus suddenly broken up, and Father de Brebeuf was compelled to return to Europe. France having however soon regained possession of Canada, Father de Brebeuf returned to it in 1633; and in the spring of the following year, he revisited his beloved Hurons in company with Father Daniel—as we have already seen. The Hurons received their old Father *Echon*—so they called him—with open arms. He now recommenced among them those herculean labors, which were to close only with his death, fifteen years later. He seemed to be in every respect adapted, both by nature and by grace, to the arduous undertaking upon which he had embarked. Possessed of every virtue in a heroic degree, burning with zeal for the salvation of souls, active and indefatigable, moulding his ardent temperament to every emergency, he was withal emphatically a man of prayer, and he walked always with God. Others marked his manifold virtues; he seemed wholly unconscious of them, and esteemed himself the last of men.

Communion with God by constant prayer was his chief delight, as well as the main source of his strength. The longer he lived, the more he became addicted to prayer. Often absorbed in God for hours together, he was detached from the senses, and seemed already to be in advance a citizen of heaven. In prayer, he was frequently favored by God with extraordinary consolations and graces. "He superabounded with joy in all his tribulations," like the great apostle of the Gentiles. By order of his superiors, he committed to writing an account of many of the wonderful things which God was pleased to manifest to him in prayer. And though the cold skeptic may smile while reading the simple recital of these wonders, yet to the man of faith their perusal cannot but afford matter of consolation and edification.[1]

---

[1] *Relation*, p. 59. Mr. Bancroft says nothing of this first visit of Father de Brebeuf, nor of his subsequent expulsion by the English Government.

Yet his devotions, however much he cherished them, did not interfere with the active and laborious duties of the mission. Throughout the whole day, he might be seen moving about among the Hurons, consoling the sick, baptizing the infants and the dying, breathing consolation into the hearts of the afflicted, refuting gainsayers with unalterable patience and meekness, and everywhere diffusing around him the sweet odor of Christ. In the midst of all these multiplied labors, the unchangeable serenity of his countenance bespoke the undisturbed tranquillity of his mind and its entire recollection in God. Always and everywhere he appeared the envoy of Him, "who went about doing good and healing all." His example captivated every heart, and his words breathed an unction which softened the most obdurate.

When the labors of the day were over, when all was hushed into tranquillity in the village, he delighted to spend whole hours in prayer, and often protracted his watchings until late in the night. When his strength was at length exhausted, and sleep overcame his wearied frame, he laid himself down on the bare earth, without divesting himself of his clothing, and took a brief repose, with no other pillow than a piece of wood. Long before the dawn, and while all were yet buried in sleep, he was again at his devotions, which continued for hours. From private prayer, he ascended the holy altar, and with a countenance all radiant with light, and with tears often trickling down his cheeks, he offered up the holy Victim of expiation. After this, he recited morning prayers with his neophytes who thronged the church; and then went through the same round of teaching, preaching, visitation of the villagers, and of incessant duties, as on the previous day.[2]

For fifteen years, he continued this manner of life. Instead of relaxing in fervor, he increased in it from day to day. Each day he became more inflamed with zeal, and more animated with an ardent longing after suffering. The Cross was the great source of his consolation and of his strength. To become like Christ; with Him "to be nailed to the Cross;" to bear on his body the marks of His passion, was the great aspiration of his soul. Sufferings were his daily bread: he banqueted only at the foot of the Cross: he gloried in nothing else. This, in fact, was his ruling sentiment, strong, as we have seen, even in death. Nothing is more frequently repeated in his Memoirs, written by himself, than the desire to be immolated for Christ. For eight or ten days together, he would feel a "vehement impulse to die for Christ."[1] Under the influence of this strong feeling, he made a solemn vow, in the presence of the blessed Trinity and of the whole court of heaven, not to decline the crown of martyrdom, if God in His mercy, as he humbly prayed, would grant him this great and priceless favor.[2] Having thus made himself a living victim of divine love, he looked upon himself ever after as the soldier of the Cross, and he vowed never to desert this glorious standard. He felt a presentiment that he should seal his faith with his blood; he incessantly prayed and panted for this glorious crown: and heaven heard his vows and granted his prayers;

---

[1] The *Relation* details many of these wonderful visitations, p. 60 *seq.* Bancroft refers to them with a lurking sneer. (III. 124)

[2] Relation, p. 69.

> "This good Father felt himself so strongly moved to advance the glory of God, and to have only this in view, that eleven years before his death, he bound himself by vow, to do and to suffer everything during the remainder of his life, which he should think would conduce to the greater glory of God: a vow which he daily renewed at the altar at the moment of receiving the holy Sacrament."[3]

This and the vow recorded above he faithfully kept to the day of his death. His sufferings and labors are almost incredible. Only the strength of God, which he received in prayer, could have enabled him to endure them all. Yet he never faltered for a moment: his sacrifice was as cheerful, as it was entire and abiding:

> "In the ardor of his zeal he frequently offered himself up to God, to endure all the martyrdoms of the world for the conversion of this people. Sometime before his death, he wrote as follows: 'O my God! why art Thou not known! Why is not this barbarous country converted to Thee! Why is not sin abolished! Why art Thou not loved! Yes, O my God! If all the torments which captives can endure in this country, amidst all the cruelty of suffering, should fall to my lot, I offer up myself to endure them all alone with my whole heart?' A little later he said: 'For two successive days I have felt a great desire of martyrdom, and a wish to endure all the torments which the martyrs have ever endured.'"[4]

The conversion of the Hurons was not effected without long and painful labors, and many sufferings on the part of the missionaries. The seed was sown in weeping, which was to bring forth fruit in rejoicing. Many of the savages clung with obstinacy to the superstition of their forefathers. Irritated by the Father's signal success, these often conspired his death, and endeavored to stir up the whole tribe against him. If any misfortune befell the Hurons — if they were unsuccessful in the chase, or suffered from famine or sickness — the missionaries, and especially *Echon*, had brought it all about.[5] In 1637, a contagious malady prevailing in the Huron encampments, the maddening shout rang through the cabins: "Death to the Jesuits! death to the Jesuits!"[6] Amidst this outcry and tumult, Father de Brebeuf moved about amongst the throng as calmly as if nothing had happened. Providence threw a shield of protection around his person: his hour had not yet come.

---

[1] "Sentio me vehementer impelli ad moriendum pro Christo."

[2] Relation, p. 63–4. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid. p. 81. [5] Ibid. p. 66 [6] Ibid. p. 67

On one occasion, a popular tumult, stimulated by the chiefs, stirred up the whole village of St. Joseph against the missionaries. Father de Brebeuf and some of his brethren were severely beaten, and the infidels threatened to burn them at the stake. Overawed however by their unalterable meekness and calmness in the midst of insult, the persecutors desisted from their fiendish purpose. In the evening, when all was still, the good Father poured forth his soul in prayer, thanked God for the privilege of having suffered contumely for His sake, and was refreshed with one of those extraordinary communications of heaven, the light of which often broke with dazzling lustre, through the opening cloud of faith, on his troubled spirit.[1]

While he was laboring among the savages of the Neutre tribe, in 1640, a Huron chief, sent by his infidel enemies among the Hurons, arrived among the Neutres, the bearer of an embassy from his tribe. The war council was convened, and the envoy offered a present of nine tomahawks, on condition that they would murder *Echon*, in such a manner that the responsibility of the deed should not rest with the Hurons. The wicked proposition was discussed during the whole night; but at length the offer was declined, and the disappointed emissary returned to his tribe.[2]

Amidst all these perils, the spirit of the good Father remained untroubled, because it reposed quietly in the bosom of God. The more he suffered, the more warmly did the love of God glow in his heart. "Often was he, while in prayer, detached from his senses, wrapped in God, and ravished with the charms of the divine beauty: sometimes his heart was transported to God with extatic raptures of love. But above all, he cherished a tender love for the sacred person of Jesus Christ, and especially for Jesus suffering on the Cross. Often he felt this love, like a burning fire, which having inflamed his heart, went on increasing in intensity each day, gradually consuming in him the impurities of nature, in order to cause the spirit of grace and the adorable spirit of Jesus Christ to reign alone in his soul. At the feast of Pentecost, in the year 1640, being engaged in prayer at night, in presence of the most holy Sacrament, he beheld himself in a moment invested, as it were, with a great fire, which burned every thing around him without consuming any thing; and as long as those flames continued, he felt himself interiorly burning with a love of God more ardent than he had yet experienced."[3]

Like all the saints, he cherished a most tender love and devotion for the immaculate Mother of God; and he ascribed many of the extraordinary graces he received to her potent intercession. The vision of her heavenly beauty cheered him in the midst of tribulation, and shed a light on his path amid difficulties and trials; as the star safely guides the mariner at night among the stormy billows. His ardent love for Jesus suffering was naturally blended with a love for His mother, who stood at the foot of the Cross, and, with her Son, drank the bitter chalice. He likewise held daily and sweet converse with the saints and martyrs of the heavenly court; and, while he was charmed with their virtues, he was strongly stimulated to emulate their example, and was powerfully aided by their prayers; which "like odors from golden vials,"[1] ascend constantly before the throne of the Lamb. He felt, in all its length and breadth, and surpassing beauty and sublimity, the sentiment embodied in the article of the Apostle's Creed — the Communion of Saints.[2].

---

[1] Relation, p. 78. [2] Ibid. p. 68. [3] Ibid.

Though thus highly favored by heaven, he was as humble as a child, and as docile as a lamb. To his brethren he exhibited a rare example of perfect obedience to the rules of the society, and to the will of his superiors. He had no will of his own; he distrusted his own lights; he cheerfully followed the direction of others. In 1631, he wrote as follows:

> "I feel that I have no talent for anything, recognizing in myself only an inclination to obey others. I believe that I am only fit to be a porter, to clean out the rooms of my brethren, and to serve in the kitchen. I mean to conduct myself in the Society as if I were a beggar, admitted into the Society by sufferance, and I will receive every thing that is granted me, as a particular favor."[3]

This was written, it will be remembered, after he had returned to France the first time, and before his second mission to the Hurons. So great was his humility, that on entering the Society, he petitioned to be admitted as a mere lay brother:

> "And again before he made his vows, he renewed the request, thinking himself unworthy of the priesthood, and fit only for the most menial offices . . . Yet was he capable of the greatest things. And when he was made superior of the Huron mission, and had many others under his charge, every one admired his skill in the management of affairs, his sweetness which gained all hearts, his heroic courage in every undertaking, his long suffering in awaiting the moments of God's good pleasure, his patience in enduring every thing, and his zeal in undertaking whatsoever might promote God's glory. His humility inclined him to embrace with love, with joy, and even with natural relish, whatever was most lowly and painful: if on a journey, he carried the heaviest burdens; if traveling in canoes, he rowed from morning till night; it was he who threw himself first into the water, and was the last to leave it, notwithstanding the rigor of the cold and the ice; his naked limbs were all red with the cold, and his whole body was transpierced with it. He was the first up in the morning to make a fire and prepare breakfast, and he was the last to retire, finishing his prayers and devotions after the others had gone to repose."
>
> "However harassed he might be, what fatigue soever he might have endured, over roads that would fill the stoutest hearts with horror, and cause them to lose courage; after all the labors of the day, and sometimes of thirty days in succession, without repose, without refreshment, without relaxation of any kind, often even not having been able during the whole time to make one meal at his leisure; he yet found time to acquit himself of all the duties demanded by the rules, . . . however protracted had been his ordinary devotions, or however harassing his ceaseless occupations. He sometimes said, 'that God had given us the day to toil for the neighbor, and the night to converse with Himself.' And what is most

---

[1] Apocalypse v. 8.

[2] Relation, p. 70–1.

[3] Ibid. p. 73.

remarkable is, that in all the labors he thus took upon himself, he did every thing so quietly and so dexterously, that one would have believed that he but acted in accordance with his natural inclination. 'I am but an ox,' he was wont to say, alluding to the meaning of his name in French, 'I am fit for nothing but carrying burdens.'"[1]

"To the continual sufferings which were inseparable from his employment in the missions, and in his frequent journeying through the snow: and to those labors which charity caused him to embrace, often above his strength, but never above his courage; he added a number of voluntary mortifications—of inflictions of the discipline every day, and often twice in the day, of frequent fasts, of hair shirts, of girdles around his body armed with iron points, of watchings which were protracted far into the night. And after all, his heart was not yet satiated with sufferings, and he believed that what he had hitherto endured was as nothing.[2]

"His meekness was the virtue which seemed to transcend all the others: it was proof against every trial. For twelve years that I have known him," writes Father Raguenau, "that I have seen him alternately superior, inferior, and on an equality with others; sometimes engaged in temporal affairs, sometimes in missionary toils and labors; dealing with the savages, whether Christians, infidels, or enemies; in the midst of sufferings, of persecution, and of calumny: I never once saw him either in anger, or even manifesting the slightest indication of displeasure. Occasionally even, some persons tried to pique him on purpose, and to surprise him in those things to which they thought his sensibility would be the most alive; but always his eye would be benign, his words full of sweetness, and his heart in an unalterable calm.[3]

"His generous courage was inspired by his distrust of his own strength on the one hand, and his unshaken confidence in God, on the other. He sought in all things to be entirely in conformity with the holy will of God. Having been one day asked, 'whether, if taken by the Iroquois, he would not feel a great repugnance to be stripped naked?' 'No,' he replied, 'for this would be the will of God, and I would not think of myself, but only of Him.' On being asked, 'whether he would not have a lively horror of being burnt alive?' 'I would dread it,' he replied, 'were I to look only to my own weakness; for the sting of a fly would, in this case, cause me to be impatient; but I trust that God will assist me at all times, and aided by His grace, I fear not the most frightful torments of the fire, more than I would the sting of a fly.'[4]

"His death crowned his life, and his perseverance was the seal of his sanctity. He died at the age of 56 years. He was born on the 25th of March, the feast of the Annunciation of Our Lady, of respectable parents, in the Diocese of Bayeux. He entered into our Society in the year 1617, on the 5th day of October. . . . . His martyrdom was accomplished on the 16th day of March, 1649."[5]

Such is an imperfect outline of the life, virtues, and glorious death of that most extraordinary man,—John de Brebeuf. He died just one hundred and thirty-two years after the commencement of the reformation, *so called*. It is more than doubtful, whether, during all this time, the Protestant churches had produced, or whether they have ever since produced, one such man as he was. And yet great and extraordinary as he certainly was, he was still but one of a mighty band of Catholic heroes, imbued with a similar spirit, and willing, all of them, to die for Christ!

---

[1] Relation, p. 74, 75. [2] Ibid p. 76. [3] Ibid. p. 77-8. [4] Ibid. p. 81-2. [5] Ibid. p. 85-6.

When he first visited the Huron tribes, in 1626, there was not found, in all that unexplored and snow-clad wilderness, one savage who invoked the name of the true God. At his death, he beheld gathered around him, as an encircling crown, no less than SEVEN THOUSAND children of the forest, whom he and his brethren had baptized.[1] He thus beheld the Cross of Jesus, which he so dearly loved, unfurled as a banner of triumph, in a place where, since the creation of the world, no true worshiper of God had been found! The impure superstitions of paganism had melted away before the light of his preaching, as the mists before the rising sun. The Christian villages of the Hurons were made to vie with those established by Catholic missionaries on the sunny plains of Paraguay.

He was, in the hands of God, the main instrument for effecting all this incalculable good. His prayers were heard, his watchings and sufferings were blessed; the Hurons were converted and reclaimed from barbarism. His glorious death crowned all his previous labors. He died at his post, like a faithful soldier, and in the manner for which he had so long sighed and so ardently prayed, day and night, for years! He richly merits the title which his brethren and cotemporaries gave him: THE APOSTLE OF THE HURONS.

---

[1] Ibid. p. 56.

XVIII. WEBSTER'S BUNKER HILL SPEECH.*

RELATIVE TREATMENT OF THE AMERICAN ABORIGINES BY THE ENGLISH AND SPANISH COLONISTS.

Mr. Webster as an orator—Compared with Preston, Calhoun, and Clay—Mr. Webster's omissions—His drift—A sound principle—But inconclusive reasoning—Different policy adopted by English and Spanish colonists—"The Anglo Saxon blood"—A parallel case—Cause of aversion to Spain—The reformation of Luther—Its influence on liberty—"The middle class"—Luther and the peasants—Protestant opinions—Religious element in Spanish colonization—Irving's testimony—Portuguese colonists—Catholic and Protestant navigators—Who introduced slavery?—Alleged cruelties of the Spaniards—Las Casas—Cruelties practised by the Puritans—Their treatment of the Aborigines—The Pokanokets—Shrewd bargaining—King Philip—The Narragansetts—Their extermination—The Pequods—"The godly Stone"—A horrible conflagration—Settling accounts—"A dark shade on the soil of Massachusetts."

Mr. Webster's Bunker Hill speech is emphatically a great oration. It bears the impress of his mighty mind, even in what we must consider the meagre and imperfect report of it in the newspapers. It contains passages worthy of the palmiest days of the great American orator. What, for instance, could excel, in simplicity, beauty, and strength, his character of Washington? Or what could surpass, in stirring interest, his appeal to the moral feelings of his countrymen, in the peroration?

Yet, notwithstanding our admiration of Mr. Webster's talents, we do not precisely place him at the head of the list of American orators. He wants the pathos of Preston, the electric rapidity of Calhoun, and the versatile graces and manifold excellencies of Clay. But in massive volume of thought, in depth and closeness of reasoning, and in the eloquence of the *head*, he is scarcely equaled, certainly not surpassed, by any. This is his *forte*, and it manifests itself on all occasions, whether he is called on to defend the Union and the constitution, or to vindicate his own state of Massachusetts. With him the flowers of rhetoric and appeals to feeling are but secondary things; he uses them with considerable effect, when they come in his way, but he would not move one step from his path, to cull all the flowers of a whole *parterre*.

These remarks are intended to apply at least as much to the manner, as to the matter of his Bunker Hill speech. This contains much that we admire, but much also to which a love of truth compels us to object. On the occasion of inaugurating a monument commemorative of a struggle which led to a nation's freedom, we could have wished to see greater enlargement of views, in the orator selected to give expression to the feelings of the day. We would have looked for a loftier tone of moral feeling, as well for less sweeping and more accurate statements of facts. Why give so undue a prominence to the "Pilgrim Fathers," and their immediate Puritan descendants, who, if there be any truth in history, were any thing but the friends of, at least, religious liberty? Why hold up this narrow minded and exclusive people, of blue-law and witch-hanging memory, as very paragons of perfection for a nation of enlightened freemen? Why not at least temper their eulogy with some qualifying remarks? Why, in speaking of the origin and characteristics of our free institutions, pass over in utter silence William Penn and Lord Baltimore, who, in Pennsylvania and Maryland, did at least as much for civil liberty as the pilgrims, and much more than they for religious liberty. The only reason we can assign for this partial view of the subject, is the fact, that the orator was himself a son of the pilgrims, and that both he and his audience partook a little,—just a little,—of the selfish narrow-mindedness of their ancestors. His object was to please his hearers, and he knew well that the high road to their affections was the beaten track which led to Plymouth rock,—"the Blarney Stone of New England!"

---

*Mr. Webster's Bunker Hill Speech, delivered at the Bunker Hill Monument, June 17, 1843, and published in the Boston Courier.

We do not purpose to examine all the statements of Mr. Webster's speech. This would lead us too far, besides causing us, perhaps, to trench upon what is not our special province. Hence we shall confine our remarks to one view of the subject, to which Mr. Webster attaches great, and, we believe, undue importance; we mean his elaborate comparison between the causes, characters, and results of English and Spanish colonization in America. This hack had been already ridden, almost to death, by school boy declaimers and Fourth of July orators; but the orator of New England mounts it anew; and, as if conscious of the distinguished honor conferred on it by its new rider, the jaded beast awakens to new life, and performs such gambols, that an unpractised observer would almost mistake it for a full blooded Arabian.

The great principle upon which the orator bases his comparison, is, we think, entirely correct. Though *true*, we do not however believe that it is *new*. Count De Maistre, and others, had made the same remark before, though in different words. After having spoken at some length on the history of the monument, and of the particular event it was designed to commemorate, the orator asks: "What then is the true and peculiar principle of the American revolution, and of the system of government which it has confirmed and established?" He answers: "Now the truth is, that the American revolution was not caused by the instantaneous discovery of principles of government before unheard of, or the practical adoption of political ideas, such as had never before entered into the minds of men. It was but the full development of principles of government, forms of society, and political sentiments, the origin of all which lay back two centuries in English and American history." And farther on, he accounts for the absence of liberty in the early Spanish colonies of America on the same principle: "As there was no liberty in Spain, how could liberty be transmitted to the Spanish colonies?"

However we might differ from him in its application, we admit the truth of the principle itself, in all its extent. It is consonant both with right reason, and with the general experience of mankind. The principle embodied in the old Latin adage—*nemo repente fit summus*—no one reaches an extreme suddenly—is specially applicable to political institutions. All changes calculated beneficially to affect whole masses of population, must be the work of time, as well as fully adapted to the condition and wants of the people thus affected. All government is essentially relative to the character and exigencies of the people to be governed. And that government may be pronounced the best, which, in reference to those exigencies, secures life, property, and character, with the least possible sacrifice of individual liberty. And our warm admiration of republican government, as the best in theory, and in practice, when the people can bear it, should not lead us into the vulgar absurdity of supposing and asserting that it is the best for all, and under all circumstances. The character and temperament of some people cannot pass through the ordeal of self-government. The French tried it, and failed. And in general, it may be asserted, that, with some exceptions which history affords, a radical democracy is little suited to the warm temperament of the South, and that it requires for its maintainance somewhat of the coolness of northern heads.

With these general remarks, to explain the practical operation of the great principle above laid down, we may easily understand why it is, that our sister republics in the South have not yet fully succeeded in the attempt at self-government. We cannot yet pronounce with safety that they have failed; much less that they cannot succeed. As the ex-secretary expresses it; "they are yet on their trial, and I hope for a favorable result." But if they do fail, it will be solely because their transition from a kingly to a republican government was too sudden and too violent,—and that the change was not perhaps adapted to their character and previous habits. In the North American colonies almost all the elements of democracy, "home governments, equality of rights, representative systems," were in full and almost unchecked operation for many years before the declaration of independence; whereas, in Spanish America, but few of these elements were in existence at all, or developed to any extent, before her colonies threw off the yoke of the mother country.

But there is another most important consideration, bearing directly on this subject, of which the Bunker Hill orator seems to have lost sight altogether; and without which it is impossible to understand fully the reason of the great political difference between English and Spanish America. He makes it a matter of boast that in all the vast region of Spanish America, there are but between one and two millions of European color and European blood; while in the United States there are, he says, fourteen millions, who rejoice in their descent from the people of the more northern part of Europe.[1] We scarcely know from what source he derived his information in regard to the number of descendants from Europeans in the Republics of the South. Unless our statistics greatly mislead us, there is about the number he mentions in Mexico alone. But let this pass. There are about twenty millions of people in Spanish America.[2] Deducting from this number, say two millions of whites, there remain eighteen millions of other races; some of them mixed, but by far the greater number pure descendants of the aborigines. Could it have been reasonably expected, that such vast masses of population, so lately reclaimed from barbarism,—some of them from cannibalism,—should have become so soon capable of the delicate business of self-government? And this, too, when nations the most refined had tried the experiment and failed?

Let us put a parallel case. Suppose,—it can be unhappily but a supposition,—suppose the good Puritans and the other American colonists, instead of exterminating the poor Indians, had humanely settled down amongst them as the *blood thirsty* Spaniards did; had patiently toiled to convert them to Christianity, and thus to reclaim them to civilization; had intermarried with them and become one people with them, like the Spaniards; and that, instead of being able to vaunt with Mr. Webster "their English civilization, their English law, and *what is more than all, their Anglo-Saxon blood,*" the people of our colonies had been, nine-tenths of them, the mere descendants of these same aborigines; would they, think you, under these circumstances, have ever declared their independence, or had they declared it, would they have been able to make it good? And to make the case entirely parallel; suppose, that the Spaniards, after having exterminated the Indians of South America, should have declared and made good their own independence; and that, while striving to imitate their noble example, we were prevented from meeting with full success by the drawback upon our energies arising from our vast semi-civilized Indian population, and that, in the midst of our difficulties, our Spanish neighbors should taunt us with our want of success, and boast their superior numbers of "pure Castilian blood,"—would we not think their jeers a refinement on cruelty? Would we not retort, by asking them, what had become of the millions of God's creatures, whom their heartless policy or cruelty had immolated? If we taunt them with their cruelty to the Indians now, what would we do then? Would we not boast of our superior humanity, and put this in, as a mitigating plea, for our want of success in self-government?

Alas! even as the case stands now, with the spectres of hundreds and thousands of poor exterminated Indians rising up from their graves, and, like the ghost which appeared to Macbeth, staring Mr. Webster full in the face, he could, without a blush, boast of the superior refinement and greater purity of blood of himself and hearers, and taunt the Spaniards with their inhumanity! "Do unto others as you would wish them to do unto you,"—is an old maxim, as sound in political economy, as it is in morals; and if the orator of Bunker Hill had given over his boasting, and attended a little more closely to this divine injunction, he would have acted more wisely as well as more justly. Was it fair in him, while instituting a comparison between North and South America, wholly to conceal a notorious fact, so honorable to the Spaniards, and so essential to enable his hearers to understand the true cause of their present political condition?

---

[1] These and the following statistics refer to the year 1843; there are at least twenty millions at present.

[2] This estimate does not include Brazil, which is Portuguese, and which contains about seven millions of people.

But there is a *secret* cause of deep aversion to Spain, and to everything Spanish. The Spaniards are Catholics, and their colonies are entirely Catholic. And none shared this feeling of hostility to Catholics more deeply, than those who were assembled around Bunker Hill monument on occasion of Mr. Webster's great speech. The orator was well aware of this state of feeling, and he knew that nothing would cater to it better, than praise of the pilgrims at the expense of Spanish colonists. We will, however, do him the justice to say, that he does not openly pander to this prejudice, he does not give in to the silly and hackneyed school-boy declamation, about the Mexicans and South Americans being unfitted for liberty, because of their being priest-ridden; but covertly, he more than intimates this, unless we have greatly misapprehended the tenor of his remarks. True, he asserts, "that making all allowance for situation and climate, it cannot be doubted by intelligent minds, that the difference now existing between North and South America is justly attributable, in a great degree, to political institutions." Had he said *wholly*, or at least adverted to the other great reason of difference just stated, he would have been nearer the truth. He ascribes the superiority of the race which peopled North America mainly to "the reformation of Luther, which broke out, kindling up the minds of men afresh, leading to new liberty of thought, and awaking in individuals energies before unknown, even to themselves." And he adds, that, "the controversies of this period changed society as well as religion." The poor Spaniards, who had not been blessed with this new *northern* light, were unfit for self-government; they continued "in the sleep of a thousand years, in the bosom of the dark ages," while their more fortunate English brethren had shaken off their slumbers, and had already awakened to visions of liberty! Well, this is all common-place enough, even for the veriest driveler. One of our fine college bred youths could have said as much, with as much truth, and with infinitely more propriety, than one of our greatest orators and most enlightened statesmen.

If the reformation of Luther prepared men for freedom, how happened it, that, in all those countries where that reformation obtained the ascendency, an absolute despotism was established on the ruins of whatever institutions of human liberty had sprung up in the "dark ages?" Whoever will read Hallam's History of the Middle Ages cannot but become aware of the fact, that, during that greatly misunderstood period, Germany enjoyed much more liberty than since the boasted reformation. What has become of the Free Cities of Germany, of the representative system, and of the exemption from taxation without the consent of the governed, all leading features in German mediæval jurisprudence? Alas! they have all been swept away by the "reformation of Luther," or buried under the rubbish of the ruins, which that "enkindling" event left behind! And what new institutions have replaced those once cherished principles of liberty? Absolute despotism, with union of church and state and immense standing armies, now constitute the last appeal of law in Protestant Germany. Prussia, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, and little Hanover, have all drunk to the dregs of this better cup of tyranny, put to their lips by those to whom the rhetorical flourishes of modern orators would fain point, as the apostles of liberty! Facts are stronger evidence than declamation, no matter how exalted the declaimer.

But was not at least England made free by the reformation? It is a *fact*, which Mr. Webster cannot deny, that for nearly one hundred and fifty years after the reformation, the regal prerogative in England swallowed up almost every other element of the government. There was scarcely a provision of *Magna Charta*, which the sovereigns of England, from Henry VIII. down to the revolution in 1688,—the brief period of the Commonwealth and of the Protectorate perhaps excepted,—did not trample under foot with impunity. The statute-book of England fully warrants this assertion. And the great *Magna Charta* of British freedom,—whence did it spring? Was it of Protestant origin? *No.* It was fully established at least three hundred years before the reformation was thought of. It was wholly and exclusively Catholic. The colonists of North America were certainly infinitely more indebted for their liberties to Cardinal Langton and the Catholic barons and yeomanry of Runnymede, than to the reformation of Luther. The restoration of British liberties after the revolution in 1688, was but a return to the great principles embodied in the Catholic *Magna Charta*;—an instrument, which, as the parliamentary records of England will show, had been revived and extended at least thirty times before the reformation. All these facts might not have been palatable to Mr. Webster's audience; yet truth required that they should not have been entirely suppressed. At least truth forbade assertions and statements contrary to, and clearly contradicted by them.

The New England orator speaks of a great "middle class which were neither barons nor mere agricultural laborers;" and to this middle class he ascribes great influence in preparing the popular mind for self-government. We acknowledge the truth and appropriateness of this remark. But did the reformation of Luther do any thing towards raising up this class? We think not. Instead of raising up the lower classes, it contributed greatly to depress them. Luther took part with the sovereigns of Germany, when the peasants rose up in rebellion to assert what they believed to be their rights. He said that "peasants should be treated like asses, — if they shake their heads, give them the stick, — *if they kick, shoot them.*" Such was the characteristic language of this boasted apostle of liberty! The truth is, that the Catholic Church of the *dark* ages did infinitely more to raise up the lower orders, and thereby to build up the middle class, than any other agency. By abolishing the serf-system, and protecting the people against the tyrants, who oppressed them during that period of anarchy, she rendered a lasting service to humanity, and laid the foundation of civil liberty. Such Protestant writers as Guizot, Hallam, Bancroft, Voigt, and Hurter[1] have freely acknowledged that fact. Pope Alexander III. A. D. 1167, "true to the spirit of his office, which during the supremacy of brute force in the middle age, made of the chief minister of religion the tribune of the people, and the guardian of the oppressed, had written, 'THAT NATURE HAVING MADE NO SLAVES, ALL MEN HAVE AN EQUAL RIGHT TO LIBERTY.' "[2]

After having duly eulogized the purity of purpose, the disinterested benevolence, and the love of liberty displayed by the pilgrim fathers, the orator of Bunker Hill proceeds to point out the chief differences between them and the colonists of Spanish America. The Puritans, forsooth, did not seek after gold—not they; but "the mines of gold and silver were the excitements to Spanish efforts:" "the colonists of English America were of the people, and a people already free;" "the conquerors and European settlers of Spanish America were mainly military commanders and common soldiers:" the former were "industrious individuals, making their own way in the wilderness, defending themselves against the savages, recognizing their right to the soil, and with a generally honest purpose of introducing knowledge as well as Christianity among them;" "Spain," with her colonists, "swooped on South America, like a falcon on its prey. Everything was gone. Territories were acquired by fire and sword. Cities were destroyed by fire and sword. Hundreds and thousands of human beings fell by fire and sword. Even conversion of Christianity was attempted by fire and sword." Finally, the pilgrims brought with them liberty and free trade; with the Spanish colonists, "the government, as well as the commerce, was a strict home monopoly."

Such are the principal points of difference between the two systems of colonization, as assigned by our orator. There is some truth, with not a little exaggeration, inaccuracy, unfairness, in his parallel. He is not accurate, when he says, that the North American colonists "recognized the right of the Indians to the soil:" at least the pious pilgrims seized on the whole territory of the Pequods, embracing the present State of Connecticut, without any equivalent.[3] It is not correct, that the Spanish

---

[1] Since become a convert to Catholicity.

[2] Bancroft, vol. 1, p. 168. He gives a free translation of the Pontiff's language, taken from his letter to Lupus, king of Valentia. This Pope of the *dark* ages employs almost the identical words of our declaration of Independence: "But since nature has created all men free, no one was, by the condition of nature, subject to servitude;" Cum autem omnes liberos natura creasset, nullus conditione naturæ fuit subditus servituti." Hist. Anglic. Script. vol 1, p. 580,—quoted by Bancroft.

[3] Bancroft, vol. ii, p. 98. See also vol. iii, p. 408, where he says, that in Massachusetts "the first planters assumed to themselves a right to treat the Indians on the foot of Canaanites and Amalecites."

Government sanctioned the bad treatment of the Indians by some of its unworthy agents, or that "conversion to Christianity was attempted by fire and sword." We will have occasion to show more fully the inaccuracy of this statement a little later;[1] but we will here insert, for the edification of the ex-secretary, the testimony of Washington Irving, who has investigated Spanish History as thoroughly, perhaps, as any other man in our country:

> "The laws and regulations (of Spain) for the government of the newly discovered countries, and the decision of the Council of the Indians on all contested points, though tinctured in some degree with the bigotry of the age, were distinguished for wisdom, justice and humanity, and do honor to the Spanish nation. It was only in the abuse of them by individuals, to whom the execution of the laws was entrusted, that these atrocities were committed. It should be remembered, also, that the same nation which gave birth to the sanguinary and rapacious adventurers, who perpetrated these cruelties, gave birth likewise to the early missionaries, like Las Casas, who followed the sanguinary course of discovery, binding up the wounds inflicted by their countrymen; men who, in a truly evangelical spirit, braved all kinds of perils and hardships, and even death itself, not through a prospect of temporal gain or glory, but through a desire to meliorate the condition, and save the souls of barbarous and suffering nations. The dauntless enterprises and fearful peregrinations of many of these virtuous men, if properly appreciated, would be found to vie in romantic daring with the heroic achievements of chivalry, with motives of a purer and far more exalted nature."[2]

But the chief fault of Mr. Webster's picture is its evident partiality. He sins more by omission than by commission. Keeping all the faults of the pilgrim fathers carefully concealed, he presents us only their good qualities over highly colored: while, on the other hand, he hides all the good deeds of the Spaniards, and exhibits only their faults, and these greatly exaggerated. We will endeavor to supply this two fold deficiency, by briefly stating some of the good deeds of the Spaniards, and some of the bad deeds of the Puritans of New England. And we will assert nothing in which we will not be fully borne out by the authority of Irving and Bancroft; by the former for Spanish, and by the latter chiefly for North American transactions. We presume that our orator will not object to the testimony of these two men, both of them Protestants, both countrymen of his own, and the latter a brother New Englander of the same old Puritan stock, and a great admirer too of the pilgrims. To consult brevity, we will confine our remarks to the Relative Treatment of the Aborigines by the Spanish and English American Colonists.

To begin with the zeal manifested by the two sets of colonists for the religious improvement of the native American races, how advantageously do the Spanish settlers compare with the English colonists of America, in this respect? Irving says:

> "It is difficult to speak too highly of the extraordinary enterprises and splendid actions of the Spaniards, in those days of discovery. Religious zeal was the very life and soul of all Spanish maritime enterprise. It was

---

[1] This subject has been already treated in some detail, so far as Mexico is concerned, in our articles on Prescott's Conquest of Mexico.

[2] Irving, Columbus, vol. ii, p. 326, Appendix Edit N York, 1831.

the great motive which stimulated Columbus to undertake his voyage of discovery; it was the darling scheme of the great patroness of Columbus — Queen Isabella. One of the great objects held out by Columbus in his undertaking was the propagation of the Christian faith. He expected to arrive at the extremity of Asia, at the vast and magnificent empire of the Grand Khan, and to visit the dependent islands, of which he had read such glowing accounts in the writings of Marco Polo. In describing these opulent and semi-barbarous regions, he reminded their majesties of the inclination manifested in former times by the Grand Khan to embrace the Christian faith; and of the missions that had been sent by various Pontiffs and pious sovereigns, to instruct him and his subjects in Catholic doctrines. He now considered himself about to effect this great work.[1] . . . Isabella had nobler inducements. She was filled with pious zeal at the idea of effecting such a great work of salvation."[2]

This feeling of religious zeal continued to predominate in the mind of Columbus, throughout his long and eventful career:

"In all his voyages, he will be found continually seeking after the territories of the Grand Khan, and even after his last expedition, and when nearly worn out by age, hardships, and infirmities, he offered, in a letter to the Spanish monarchs, written from a bed of sickness, to conduct any missionary to the territories of the Tartar emperor, who would undertake his conversion."[3]

This was his ruling passion strong in death. In his last will and testament, he recommended this darling object of his soul to his executors and to his son Diego:

"Item: when a suitable time shall come, he shall order a church to be built in the island of Hispaniola, and in the most convenient spot, to be called *Santa Maria de la Concepcion;* to which is to be annexed an hospital on the best plan, like those of Italy and Castile." . . .

"Item: I also order Diego my son, or whomsoever may inherit after him, to spare no pains in having and maintaining in the island of Hispaniola, four good professors of theology, to the end and aim of their studying and laboring to convert to our holy faith the inhabitants of the Indies; and in proportion as, by God's will, the revenues of the estate shall increase, in the same degree shall the number of teachers and devout persons increase, who are to strive to make Christians of the natives; *in attaining which no expense shall be thought too great.*"[4]

Irving draws this character of the great Columbus:

"He was devoutly pious; religion mingled with the whole course of his thoughts and actions, and shone forth in all his private and most unstudied writings. Whenever he made any great discovery, he celebrated it by solemn thanks to God. The voice of prayer and the melody of praise rose from his ships, as they first beheld the new world; and his first action on landing was to prostrate himself on the earth, and render up thanksgivings. Every evening, the *Salve Regina,* and other vesper hymns were chaunted by his crew; and masses were performed in the beautiful groves that bordered the wild shore of this heathen land. The religion thus deeply seated in his soul, diffused a sober dignity and a divine composure over his whole demeanor. His language was pure and guarded, free from all imprecations, oaths, and other irreverent expressions. All his great enterprises were undertaken *in the name of the Holy Trinity;* and he partook of the holy

---

[1] Irving, Columbus i. 72. [2] Ibid. p. 73. [3] Id. ii, 298, Appendix. [4] Ibid.

Sacrament previous to embarkation. He observed the festivals of the Church in the wildest situations. The Sabbath was for him a day of sacred rest, on which he never set sail from a port, unless in a case of extreme necessity."[1]

These religious sentiments continued to animate him to his last breath:

"Having thus scrupulously attended to all the claims of affection, loyalty and justice upon earth, Columbus turned his thoughts to heaven; and having received the holy sacraments and performed all the pious offices of a devout Christian, he expired with great resignation on the day of Ascension, 20th of May, 1506, being about seventy years of age. His last words were: *In manus Tuas, Domine, commendo spiritum meum* —into Thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit."[2]

It is not a little remarkable, that he believed himself specially guided by heaven in the great work of discovering America. Thus, in the representations which he made to Ferdinand and Isabella, when sent back to Spain bound with chains by the cruel Bobadilla,

> "He avowed in the fullest manner his persuasion, that from his earliest infancy, he had been chosen by heaven for the accomplishment of those two great designs, the discovery of the new world, and the rescue of the holy sepulchre. For this purpose, in his tender years, he had been guided by a divine impulse to embrace the profession of the sea. . . . His understanding had been opened by the Deity, as with a palpable hand, so as to discover the navigation of the Indies; and he had been inflamed with ardor to undertake the enterprise. '*Animated as by a heavenly fire,*' he adds, '*I come to your Majesties; . . . —who will doubt that this light was from the holy Scriptures, illuminating you as well as myself, with rays of marvelous clearness?*' "[3]

Nor were Columbus and Isabella alone in this; theirs was the general feeling of the age. Spanish and Portuguese enterprise was stimulated by this exalted motive. It seemed as if divine providence, at this epoch, meant to provide new and ample fields for the exercise of this lofty feeling, in new worlds discovered or visited for the first time, both in the east and in the west; and thereby more than compensate the Church by accessions to her numbers from among new people, for what she was to lose in the religious dissensions of the sixteenth century. While the Catholic Columbus was discovering America, another illustrious Catholic, the Portuguese Vasco de Gama, doubled, for the first time, the Cape of Good Hope in 1497; and another Portuguese, Pedro Alvares Cabral, discovered Brazil, and made a voyage to the East Indies. Nor were the vast territories, thus thrown open to Europeans, left unimproved by religious culture. Wherever the Spaniards and the Portuguese penetrated, there also the Catholic religion was established. The missionary accompanied the conqueror, softening the horrors of war, and planting the cross of Christ by the side of the banner of the earthly monarch. A holy zeal for the salvation of souls thus stimulated, accompanied, and crowned every noble enterprise of discovery and conquest.

It had ever been so in Catholic times. Religious zeal had ever culminated over every merely earthly motive or consideration. Thus when the three great Venitian navigators and travelers, Nicholas, Maffeo, and Marco Polo, penetrated into the heart of Asia in the thirteenth century, the first thing thought of was the introduction of Christianity into the new regions they explored. The two first returned to Europe in 1269, with letters from the Grand Khan to the Pope asking for one hundred Christian missionaries. They revisited Tartary in 1271, carrying with them two missionaries, and letters from Pope Gregory X.[1] And whoever will read the annals of the Church of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries will not fail to remark, what vast accessions to her numbers were made in Asia during that period, chiefly by missionaries from the Franciscan and Dominican orders, then recently established.[2]

---

[1] Ibid. vol. ii, pp. 202, 203.

[2] Ibid. p. 198.

[3] Ibid. p. 74.

When Columbus discovered the new world, the first thing he did on landing, was "to throw himself on his knees, kiss the earth, and return thanks to God with tears of joy." He then erected a banner "emblazoned with a green cross," and recited a prayer, which was subsequently used by Bilboa, Cortes, Pizarro, and other Spanish commanders in their voyages of discovery. The purport of the latter portion of it was, to "bless and glorify the name, and to praise the majesty of God, for having vouchsafed to make use of His humble servant, as an instrument for having His holy name made known and preached in that other part of the world;"—so paramount was this consideration of religion in all that the Spaniards undertook or did.[3] The consequence of all this religious zeal has been the conversion to Christianity of the vast body of the aboriginal population of Spanish America; and this result alone, should silence forever those whose prejudice leads them to sneer at the bigotry and avarice of the Spaniards.

Was the result similar in North America? The Jesuits, indeed, converted whole tribes of Indians in Canada, and in the valley of the Mississippi.[4] But what did the Puritans do, with all their affected *purity* of purpose, and with all their cant about disinterested zeal for religion? They did very nearly nothing. If they had "a generally honest purpose of introducing knowledge as well as Christianity among the Indians"—it must have remained a mere *purpose;* for in general they seemed to take very little concern about the matter. We read of their preachers persecuting one another,—driving Roger Williams, and Ann Hutchison, Wheelwright, Aspinwall and others into the wilderness for opinion's sake, deeming them "unfit to live in the colony;"[5] we read of their assisting at the trial and hanging of witches at Salem; and of their marching with, and saying long prayers for, the armies that were engaged in exterminating the poor Indians; but did they do anything to evangelize them? We read of John Eliot and a few others making a feeble effort for this purpose, among the Indians in the immediate vicinity of Boston; but Bancroft testifies to their almost total failure. "Yet Christianity had not spread beyond the Indians on Cape Cod, Martha's Vineyard, and Nantucket, and the seven feeble villages around Boston. The Narragansetts, a powerful tribe, counting at least a thousand warriors, hemmed in between Connecticut and Plymouth, restless and jealous, retained their old belief; and Philip of Pokanoket, at the head of seven hundred warriors, professed with pride the faith of his fathers."[1] The Puritans exterminated a great number of tribes as we shall soon see;— they did not convert *one* to Christianity!

---

[1] For an interesting notice of the three Polo's, see Irving, Columbus ii. 290 seqq.

[2] Full particulars on this most interesting subject will be found in the Church History of Becchetti—a continuation of Cardinal Orsi's work.

[3] See Irving, Columbus i. 108 note, for the prayer in Latin.

[4] See Bancroft, vol. iii, Chap. 20, for a most interesting account of the labors and success of the Jesuit missionaries in North America; quoted in a previous paper.

[5] Bancroft, vol. i, pp. 367–8, and 390 seqq.

The indefatigable and saintly Father Sebastian Rasles labored with earnest zeal, for more than a quarter of a century, among the Indians of Maine, many of whom he succeeded in converting to the Catholic faith. His missions were in a most flourishing condition, when the jealousy of the neighboring colony of Massachusetts was aroused; nor did it sleep, until it brought about the most barbarous murder of the good missionary, and the massacre, or dispersion of the tribes which he had converted to Christianity! The following passage furnishes a curious contrast between the *modus operandi*, and the respective success of Catholic and Protestant missionaries in converting the Indians. "The government of Massachusetts attempted in its turn to establish a mission; and its minister made a mockery of purgatory and the invocation of saints, of the cross and the rosary. 'My Christians,' retorted Rasles, 'believe the truth of the Catholic faith, but are not skilful disputants;' and he himself proposed a defence of the Roman Church. Thus Calvin and Loyola met in the woods of Maine. But the Protestant minister, unable to compete with the Jesuit in the affections of the Indians, returned to Boston, while the friar remained 'the incendiary of mischief.'"[2] After the martyrdom of Rasles, so graphically related by Bancroft,[3] and the breaking up of his missionary establishments, "the influence by commerce took the place of influence by religion, and English trading houses supplanted French missions."[4] Thus it was, that in numerous cases the filthy love of lucre marred the noble work of God! So much for the disinterestedness of the Puritans, and their "generally honest purpose of introducing knowledge, as well as Christianity, among the natives!"

The early Spanish and Portuguese navigators compare advantageously, in character and usefulness to mankind, with those of England engaged in exploring and peopling North America. Where, in English naval annals of discovery, will you find names as illustrious as those of De Gama, Cabral, the Pinzons, Vespucci, and Columbus? In fact, the early English navigators, Sir John Hawkins, Raleigh, Drake, and Weymouth, were as unprincipled as they were adventurous. They were little more than bucaneers and pirates on a large scale. We will give a few facts on this subject.

When Weymouth was about to sail from the mouth of the Penobscot,

---

[1] Bancroft ii, 97.
[2] Ibid. iii, 334–5.
[3] Ibid. 336, seq.
[4] Ibid.

"five natives were decoyed on board the ship, and Weymouth, returning to England, gave three of them to Sir Ferdinand Gorges, a friend of Raleigh, and governor of Plymouth."[1] Of Sir John Hawkins, Bancroft says:

> "The odious distinction of having first interested England in the slave trade belongs to Sir John Hawkins. He had fraudulently transported a whole cargo of Africans to Hispaniola; the rich returns of sugar, ginger, and pearls attracted the attention of queen Elizabeth, and when a new expedition was prepared, she was induced not only to protect but to share in the traffic. In the accounts which Hawkins himself gives of one of his expeditions, he relates that he set fire to a city, of which the huts were covered with dry fallen leaves, and out of eight thousand inhabitants, succeeded in capturing two hundred and fifty. (Query—how many did he burn?) The deliberate and even self-approving frankness with which this act of atrocity is related, and the lustre which the fame of Hawkins acquired, display in the strongest terms the depravity of public sentiment (English) in the age of Elizabeth. . . . . Yet the commerce, on the part of England, in the Spanish ports was by the laws of Spain illicit, as well as by the laws of morals detestable; and when the sovereign of England participated in its hazards, its profits and its crimes, she became at once a smuggler and a slave merchant."[2]

The Catholic Church used every effort to prevent the slave trade, and to mitigate the severities occasionally exercised by the Spaniards against the Indians:

> "A series of papal bulls had indeed secured to the Portuguese the exclusive commerce with western Africa, but the slave trade between Africa and America, was, I believe, never expressly sanctioned by the See of Rome. Even Leo X. declared that 'not the Christian religion only, but nature herself cries out against the state of slavery.' And Paul III., (June 10, 1543) in two separate briefs, imprecated a curse (*anathema*) on the Europeans, who should enslave Indians, or any other class of men. It even became usual for Spanish vessels, when they sailed on voyages of discovery, to be attended by a priest, whose benevolent duty it was, to prevent the kidnapping of the aborigines."[3]— . . . "Ximenes, the gifted coadjutor of Ferdinand and Isabella, saw in advance the danger which it required centuries to reveal, and refused to sanction the introduction of negroes into Hispaniola, believing that the favorable climate would increase their number, and infallibly lead them to a successful revolt."[4]

And yet, in spite of Roman Pontiffs and of Ximenes, negroes were extensively introduced into Hispaniola, thanks chiefly to the unprincipled avarice of Sir John Hawkins, of Queen Elizabeth, and of the English; and the prediction of the great Ximenes was fully verified, in the massacre and expulsion of the whites from that island!

Much has been said and written about the cruelty of the Spaniards towards the Indians,—about their having forced them to labor in the mines, sold them into bondage, and wasted their numbers by cruel exactions, and by fire and sword. We have no mission to defend these cruelties; but we are convinced that there is much exaggeration on the subject. The severities in question were neither general, nor long continued, nor authorized by the Spanish Government. They occurred in the sudden excitement of conquest, and they were checked so soon as the conduct of the individuals, who perpetrated them, could be investigated. Washington Irving has told us above, what was the line of conduct pursued by the Spanish government, and we have also seen how those cruelties were rebuked by the Roman Pontiffs. We will give a few additional facts. The oppression of the Indians of Hispaniola by the weak and unwise Bobadilla

---

[1] Bancroft i, 115

[2] Ibid. i, 173 seq.

[3] Ibid. i, 172.

[4] Ibid.

> "Aroused the indignation of Isabella; and when Ovando was sent to supersede Bobadilla in 1502, the natives were pronounced free: they immediately refused to labor in the mines. Ovando represented to the Spanish sovereigns in 1503, that ruinous consequences resulted to the colony from this entire liberty granted to the Indians. He stated, that the tribute could not be collected, for the Indians were lazy and improvident, that the natives could only be kept from vices and irregularities by occupation; that they now kept aloof from the Spaniards, and from all instruction in the Christian faith. This last consideration had an influence with Isabella, and drew a letter from the sovereigns to Ovando in 1503, in which he was ordered to spare no pains to attach the natives to the Spanish nation and the Catholic religion. To make them labor moderately, *if absolutely essential to their own good*, but to temper authority with persuasion and kindness. *To pay them regularly and fairly for their labor, and to have them instructed in religion on certain days.*"[1]

Such was the general and authorized policy of Spain in regard to the Indians. Was not its basis humanity, hallowed by religion? Again, when some of the Indians were brought to Spain, and sold at Seville as slaves, "Isabella, in a transport of virtuous indignation, ordered them to be sent back to their country."[2] After the death of De Soto, the Spaniards were about to abandon their conquest of Florida. At this juncture, Louis Cancello and two other Dominicans offered their services, to preach to and convert those savages whom Spanish arms could not conquer. Their offer was accepted; but these devoted men all fell martyred victims to their zeal. "Christianity was to conquer the land, against which so many expeditions had failed. The Spanish governors were directed to favor the design; all slaves that had been taken from the northern shore of the gulf of Mexico were to be manumitted and restored to their country."[3] So true is it, that wherever the authority of the Spanish government and of the Catholic religion could be fully felt, there the fetters of the captive were stricken off, and he became free. And at this day, there is scarcely a vestige of slavery in all Spanish America.[4]

Most of the accounts of Spanish cruelty rest upon the authority of Las Casas. He was a great and good man, but the statements contained in his work entitled "Relation of the Indies," should be received with many grains of allowance. The impression made upon his exquisitely sensitive heart, by the sight of the wrongs inflicted on his beloved Indians, was so acute, and his interest for redressing their grievances so intense, that in speaking of the cruelties practiced against them he greatly exaggerated. Almost all the critics admit this. Dr. Robertson and Washington Irving both give the same opinion.[1] Charlevoix says, "that he had too lively an imagination, and permitted himself to be carried by away it;" and "there reigns in his book a spirit of over sensitiveness and exaggeration, that makes greatly against it."[2] His statements were controverted at the time by Dr. Sepulveda; and a lively controversy was carried on in Spain. Charles V. and the learned Dominico Soto, his confessor, embarrassed by contradictory statements from the two parties, could not come to a decision as to the real merits of the dispute.

---

[1] Irving, Columbus ii. 162. [2] Irving, Columbus ii. 320. [3] Bancroft i. 60.

[4] The Portuguese colonies have not in this respect imitated the example of those established by Spain. Slavery is also maintained on the Spanish Islands of Cuba and Porto Rico.

But the unremitted efforts of Las Casas to meliorate the spiritual and temporal condition of the Indians are above all praise:

> "The whole of his future life, a space exceeding sixty years, was devoted to vindicating the cause, and endeavoring to meliorate the sufferings of the natives. As a missionary, he traversed the wilderness of the new world in various directions, seeking to convert and civilize them; as a companion and protector, he made several voyages to Spain, vindicated their wrongs before courts and monarchs, wrote volumes in their behalf, and exhibited a zeal and constancy, and intrepidity, worthy of an apostle. He died at an advanced age of ninety-two years, and was buried at Madrid, in the church of the Dominican convent of Atocha, of which fraternity he was a member."[3]

Such was Las Casas; and yet he was but one of a numerous band of devoted men. What a contrast between his spirit and life, and that of any of the Puritan preachers of New England! Take, for example, Cotton Mather, one of the most distinguished among the ministers of the pilgrims. How fierce and fanatical the spirit he displayed throughout his long life, and especially during the little reign of terror, — from February to October of the year 1692, — while the trials for witchcraft were going on at Salem! He and his creature, the deputy governor Stoughton, together with the ministers Parris and Noyes, got up and enacted that comic tragedy, in which great numbers of men, women, and children perished on the scaffold: "And uttering a midnight cry, he wrestled with God to awaken the churches to something remarkable. A religious excitement was resolved on. 'I obtained of the Lord that he would use me,' says the infatuated man, 'to be a herald of His kingdom now approaching.'"[4] Whoever reads the account of these strange proceedings, as given by Bancroft, must feel his blood tingle in his veins, and must sigh over the strange fanaticism of the pilgrims.

What will be thought, for instance, of this curious extract from the records? "At the trial of George Burroughs, a minister, the bewitched persons pretended to be dumb. 'Who hinders those witnesses,' says Stoughton, 'from testifying?' 'I suppose the devil,' answered Burroughs.

---

[1] Irving, Columbus ii, p. 825; Appendix. Dr. Robertson calls him "a restless and dissatisfied man." History of America.

[2] Histoire de S. Domingue, L. 5, A. D. 515, & L. 6, A. D. 1547.

[3] Irving, Columbus ii. 320.

[4] Bancroft iii. 81.

'How comes the devil,' retorted the chief judge, 'so loath to have any testimony borne against you?' And the question was effective. Besides he had given proofs of great, if not preternatural muscular strength. Cotton Mather calls the evidence 'enough;' the jury gave a verdict of 'guilty.'"[1] What will be thought of the fierce exclamation of the minister Noyes, when eight persons were hung up together for witchcraft; "there hang eight fire-brands of hell!"[2] And what of the heartless speech of Cotton Mather to the crowd assembled to witness the execution of Burroughs?[3] Alas for human nature, if these men are to be held up as paragons for imitation!

It ill becomes the children of the pilgrim fathers to taunt the Spaniards with their inhumanity to the natives. The Puritans of New England have to settle a much deeper and darker score in this matter. It may not be generally known, that it was quite common of old to kidnap and sell into foreign bondage the Aborigines of North America. Yet no fact of history is more undoubted: "The practice of selling the natives of North America into foreign bondage continued for near two centuries, and even the sternest morality pronounced the sentence of slavery and exile on the captives, whom the field of battle had spared. The excellent Winthrop enumerates Indians among his bequests. The articles of the early New England confederacy class persons among the spoils of war. A scanty remnant of the Pequod tribe in Connecticut, the captives treacherously made by Waldron in New Hampshire, the harmless fragments of the tribe of Annawon, the orphan offspring of King Philip himself, were all doomed to the same hard destiny of perpetual bondage. The clans of Virginia and Carolina, for more than a hundred years, were hardly safe against the kidnapper. *The universal public* (English) *mind was long and deeply vitiated.*"[4]

The treatment of the Indians by the Catholics of Maryland is a brilliant exception to this remark, and forms one bright page at least in our early colonial history. True, a border war raged there also for a brief space, commenced by the Indians, who "had not yet entirely recovered from the jealousies which the malignant Clayborne had infused." But soon "peace was re-established on the usual terms of submission and promises of friendship, and rendered durable by the prudent legislation of the assembly, and the firm humanity of the government. The pre-emption of the soil was reserved to Lord Baltimore, kidnapping an Indian made a capital offence, and the sale of arms prohibited as a felony."[5]

Where now are the numerous and flourishing tribes of Indians which once peopled New England? Where are the Pokanokets, the Narragansetts, the Pequods, the Mohegans, and the Mohawks, to say nothing of other tribes? All have disappeared from the face of the earth, thanks to the cold-blooded policy and heartless cruelty of the Puritans! They all vanished at the first dawn of *English* civilization, like snow under the rays of the sun! First over-reached in trade by the cunning Yankees, then hemmed up within restricted territories, then goaded into war, and then exterminated by fire and sword:—such was in general the mode of dealing with the poor natives of the north-eastern states; a heartless policy subsequently followed, with a few honorable exceptions, by the North American colonists. These are strong assertions, and they must prove unpalatable to those descendants of the pilgrims, who boast their pure "Anglo Saxon blood," and taunt the Spaniards with their cruelty. But we will make them all good by indubitable testimony.

---

[1] Bancroft, iii. 84.

[2] Ibid. p. 93.

[3] Bancroft, ibid.

[4] Ibid. P. I, 168–9. Speaking of the traffic in white slaves sold to the colonies, Bancroft says: "At the corresponding period in Ireland, the crowded exportation of Irish Catholics was a frequent event, and was attended by aggravations hardly inferior to the usual atrocities of the African slave trade. i. 176.

[5] Bancroft, i, 253.

The Pokanokets were the first tribe which sheltered the pilgrims after their landing on Plymouth rock: and they were the first to fall victims to their insidious and ungrateful policy. The venerable old chief Sachem of this tribe, Massasoit,—who had thrown open the door of his wigwam to the new comers, had fed them with his bread, warmed them at his fire, and cordially welcomed them to the new world, had already departed this life, else he might have lived so witness the wanderings of his fugitive son, king Philip of Mount Hope, and the cruel bondage under the burning sun of Bermuda, of his orphan grand-son, the only heir to his dignity, and the last of his race!

We have already seen what reliance is to be placed on the assertion of Mr. Webster, "that the Pilgrims recognized the right of the natives to the soil." Bancroft will tell us how they recognized this right in the Pokanokets. Repeated sales of land had narrowed the domains of these original proprietors of the soil:

> "And the English had artfully crowded them into the tongues of land, as most suitable and convenient for them.[1] There they could be more easily watched for the frontiers of the narrow peninsulas were inconsiderable. Thus the two chief seats of the Pokanokets were the necks of land, which we now call Boston and Tiverton. As population pressed on other savages, the west was open: but as the English villages drew nearer and nearer to them, their hunting grounds were put under culture; and, as the ever urgent importunity of the English (pilgrims) was quieted for a season by partial concessions from the unwary Indians, their natural parks were turned into pastures; their best fields for planting corn were gradually alienated; their fisheries were impaired by more skillful methods; and as wave after wave succeeded, they found themselves deprived of their broad acres, and by their own legal (!) contracts, driven as it were into the sea."[2]

As they were not amphibious and could not starve, they naturally became indignant; and "when the expressions of common passion were repeated by an Indian tale-bearer, fear magnified the plans of the tribes into an organized scheme of resistance."[3] King Philip, , their chief

---

[1] Winslow, a cotemporary quoted by Bancroft, avows this cruel policy.

[2] Vol. ii, p. 99. The first chief who made a treaty with the Pilgrims was Maſsasoit, who observed it religiously as long as he lived. It is curious that, before he ratified the treaty he drank a prodigious draft of rum. (See 1st B. of Hist. p. 29.) So much for early Yankee shrewdness in bargaining!

[3] Ibid.

Sachem was, on suspicion, summoned before a Puritan tribunal, to which he had been once before compelled to deliver up his arms. The indignation of his tribe broke out into a flame at this indignity offered to their chief, and the Indian informer who had betrayed him was murdered. The murderers were ferreted out, condemned, and hung; the Indians retaliated on the American settlers, and thus a war of extermination broke out in New England.[1] The Pokanokets were exterminated, and Philip became a wanderer:

> "Once he escaped narrowly, leaving his wife and only son prisoners. 'My heart breaks,' cried the tattooed chieftain, in the agony of his grief—'now I am ready to die!' His own followers began to plot against him to make terms for themselves, and in a few days he was shot by a faithless Indian. The captive orphan was transported. So perished the princes of the Pokanokets! Sad to them had been their acquaintance with civilization! The first ship that came on her coast had kidnapped men of their kindred; and now the harmless boy, who had been cherished as an only child, and the future Sachem of their tribes, the last of the family of Massasoit, was sold into bondage, to toil as a slave under the sun of Bermuda!"[2]

The Narragansetts do not appear to have joined the alleged Indian league against the whites. Yet, when the war broke out, "the little army of the colonists entered the territories of the Narragansetts, and from the reluctant tribe extorted a treaty of neutrality, with a promise to deliver up every hostile Indian."[3] And because, in violation of this extorted treaty, they subsequently had the humanity to afford shelter to such of their fugitive brethren among the Pokanokets, as had escaped extermination:

> "It was resolved to regard them as enemies; and a little before the winter solstice, a thousand men levied by the united colonies, and commanded by the brave Josiah Winslow, a native of New England, invaded their territory. . . . Feeble palisades could not check the determined valor of the white men, and the group of Indian cabins was soon set on fire. Thus were swept away the humble glories of the Narragansetts. The winter's store of the tribe; their curiously wrought baskets full of corn; their famous strings of Wampum; their wigwams nicely lined with mats,—all the little comforts of savage life were consumed. And yet more,—*their old men, their women, their babes perished by hundreds in the fire!* Then, indeed, was the cup of misery full for these red men. Without shelter and without food, they hid themselves in a cedar swamp, with no defense against the cold but boughs of evergreen trees. They prowled the forest and pawed up the snow, to gather nuts and acorns, they dug the earth for ground nuts; they ate remnants of horse flesh as a luxury; they sank down from feebleness and want of food."[4]

Their brave old chief Caronchet, after wandering and suffering much, was at length taken prisoner. Yet his spirit was not broken. "His life was offered him, if he would procure a treaty of peace; he refused the offer with disdain. Condemned to death, he only answered, I like it well; I shall die before I say anything unworthy of myself."[1] The historian closes the sad story of the Narragansetts, with these memorable words: "Of the once-prosperous Narragansetts, of old the chief tribe of New England, hardly one hundred men remained. The sword, fire, famine, and sickness, had swept them from the face of the earth."[2]

---

[1] Ibid. p. 100.

[2] Ibid. vol. ii, p. 103. The historian informs us, that "in the progress of the year, between two and three thousand Indians were killed or submitted." Ibid.

[3] Ibid. p. 102.

[4] Ibid. p. 104-5

If anything could surpass the cold blooded cruelty of these acts of atrocity, it was the treatment of the Pequods of Connecticut, whose territory the children of the pilgrims had invaded, without purchase or any equivalent whatever, thereby showing how far "they recognized in the natives the right to the soil." "After nearly a whole night spent, at the request of the soldiers in importunate prayer by the 'very learned and *godly* Stone,'"[3] the colonial army commanded by John Mason, proceeded to attack the Pequod towns, the principal of which they surprised at break of day:

> "The superiority of numbers was with them (the Pequods), and fighting closely hand to hand, though the massacre spread from wigwam to wigwam, victory was tardy. '*We must burn them!*' shouted Mason, and cast a firebrand to windward among the light mats of the Indian cabins. Hardly could the English withdraw to encompass the place, before the whole encampment was in a blaze. Did the helpless natives climb the palisades; the flames assisted the marksmen to take good aim at the unprotected men: did they attempt to sally; they were cut down by the English broad swords. The carnage was complete: about six hundred Indians, men, women and children, perished; most of them in the hideous conflagration! In about an hour, the whole work of destruction was finished, and two only of the English (Puritans) had fallen in the battle. The sun, as it rose serenely in the east, was the witness of the victory."[4]

And such a victory! We think these facts abundantly sustain the statements made above. We might pursue this line of illustration and proof still farther; for, unhappily, the materials for it are but too abundant. But we sicken at these enormities.

Such then were the tender mercies of the Puritans! Such their claims to our admiration and imitation! We will not deny their good qualities: but we must be allowed to think, that the shades predominated over the lights in their character; and that if, in spite of its shades, their character is still luminous, it is with such a lurid light as is emitted by paintings belonging to the class called by the Italians *chiaro oscuro* — clear obscure.

We will leave Mr. Webster to settle his account, as best he may, with his two countrymen, Irving and Prescott, as well as with God and his own conscience! While he is engaged in the settlement, would it not be well for him to exert his powerful influence in New England, to have removed one dark spot from the escutcheon of his state,— to clear away those gloomy ruins of Mount Benedict which still crown Bunker Hill, in the immediate vicinity of the monument, and which "cast a dark shadow on the soil of Massachusetts"? They too are monumental. They commemorate a dark event, the injustice of which, is yet unredressed; and they prove, that the fierce and sternly intolerant spirit of the Puritans is not yet extinct. Unless removed by the *justice* of Massachusetts, we trust that those ruins will be as abiding as the Bunker Hill monument itself!

---

[1] Ibid. p. 106. [2] Ibid, p. 109. [3] Ibid vol. 1, p. 399.

[4] Bancroft, 400–1. It was usual for the different colonial governments of North America to offer bounties for the scalps of the Indians. Thus, the government of Massachusetts "stimulated the activity of private parties, by offering for each Indian scalp at first a bounty of fifteen, and afterwards of a hundred pounds." Bancroft, iii. 336.

Since the above was written, the children of the Puritans have exhibited such unmistakeable signs of bigoted intolerance, as to prove to all the world that they are worthy of their illustrious ancestors. The children have, indeed, far outstripped the fathers in the race of persecution. Four or five Catholic churches sacked or destroyed by them, some on the hallowed anniversary festival of American Independence; their Catholic fellow-citizens denounced, slandered, and vilified by hired street brawlers; the mob spirit openly invoked against the property and lives of Catholics: — these are some among the recent exploits of those who boast their "Anglo-Saxon blood," and glory in being the descendants of the pilgrim fathers! They are heartily welcome to all the glory they can derive from such achievements as these!

XIX. OUR COLONIAL BLUE LAWS.*

ARTICLE I.—UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

Why we treat this subject—Who are, and who have been the persecutors?—Meaning of the term *Blue Laws*—Effort at concealment—Bancroft's reserve—Other historians of New England—Character of the Puritans—Their good and their bad qualities—Their treatment of the Aborigines—Their inconsistency—Two classes of Blue Laws—Union of Church and State—Conformity—The franchise—Established religion—Observance of the Sabbath—Severe enactments—Law against priests—Spirit of persecution in New York—Miscellaneous laws— Indians and wolves—Use of tobacco—Manner of dress—Cut of the hair—Matrimony—And divorce—By whom were the Blue Laws repealed?—Some Blue Laws of Virginia—The land of "steady habits"—Catholic Colony of Maryland.

If we be asked, why we treat of the Blue Laws at this particular time, our answer is at hand. We are moved by no feeling of uncharitableness, but simply by a love of historic truth, and a motive of just self-defense. A systematic attempt has been made to fasten all the odium of narrow-mindedness and persecution on the Catholic Church; and at present this is the favorite battle-cry of those who seek, in this free country, to render Catholics hateful to their fellow-citizens, and to deprive them even of their undoubted civil rights. With strange inconsistency, this undisguised effort to crush Catholic liberty and rights, is made in the name of liberty itself! It is with this hallowed word on their lips, that the misguided agents of a truculent secret political society rush to the sack or burning of our churches, and to the open slaughter or secret assassination of our people! This much-abused name of liberty is the staple of the hired street brawler, who openly excites the mob to riot and arson, in our heretofore peaceful streets and highways. The minister of religion, too, whose office should incline him to exhort men to the love of God and of the neighbor, is not unfrequently found to take up the same maddening cry, and to throw his influence into the scale of hatred and anarchy, instead of that of love and peace!

---

* I. *The Blue Laws of New Haven Colony, usually called the Blue Laws of Connecticut; Quaker Laws of Plymouth and Massachusetts; Blue Laws of New York, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina. First Record of Connecticut; interesting extracts from Connecticut Records; cases of Salem witchcraft; charges and banishment of Rev. Roger Williams, &c., and other interesting and instructive antiquities. Compiled by an Antiquarian.* Hartford: Printed by Case, Tiffany & Co. 1838. 1 vol. 12mo. pp. 336.

II. *The Code of* 1650*; being a compilation of the earliest Laws and Orders of the General Court of Connecticut: also, the Constitution, or civil compact entered into and adopted by the towns of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield, in* 1638–9. *To which are added some extracts from the laws and judicial proceedings of the New Haven Colony, commonly called Blue Laws.* Hartford: Judd, Loomis & Co. 1836. 1 vol. 16mo., pp. 119.

The most singular feature in the present unholy warfare against Catholics in this country, is the fact, which can be established by the most overwhelming evidence, that while we are made to bear all the odium of intolerance and persecution, our opponents, and they ALONE, are fairly open to the charge, so far at least as the history of this country is concerned. We defy any one to lay his finger on the fact of history, which proves that Catholics have ever been guilty of a single act of persecution in the United Stats, either before or since the revolution. This matter is easily tested. Our standard histories are mostly the productions of Protestant writers, and their pages are spread out before the world. If any such act of intolerance can be pointed out, as having been perpetrated by Catholics in this country, we would really desire to see the evidence, even on respectable Protestant authority; for we have never yet found a solitary instance, though our reading in this department of history has been tolerably extensive. What we want is FACTS, not WORDS. Until our bitter opponents are prepared to meet this fair and reasonable issue, they should surely remain silent, if they have any sense of decency or of justice left.

Have American Catholics ever attempted to get up a persecution of slander against their fellow-citizens? Have they ever employed street preachers to vilify their brother religionists? Have they ever sought to burn Protestant churches? Have they ever enacted persecuting laws, when—as in the Maryland colony—they had the power to do so. If they have done or attempted none of these things, then why all this bitter opposition to their civil and religious rights in this country?

Can our enemies come out of this ordeal of historic facts equally unscathed? We think not. The evidence of all our colonial history must be blotted out, before they can hope to escape the accusation, that, while so strongly denouncing their neighbors for a persecuting spirit, they and their ancestors have been, in point of fact, the only persecutors in this hemisphere!

Much as we regret to write it, the narrow-minded persecuting spirit of the Puritans still survives in their descendants. Survives,—did we say? We are unjust to the memory of the Puritans. They had, at least, some method, some religion, and some *decency* in their persecution; their descendants have retained only their inveterate hatred of Catholicity. This does not, of course, apply to all or even to the greater portion of American Protestants; but it is fairly applicable to all those who are either openly or tacitly engaged in the present unscrupulous and unprincipled crusade against Catholics in this *free* country.

It is with these views that we republish the articles written some years ago on our Colonial Blue Laws. The facts we will unfold, entirely on Protestant authority, will show conclusively, who first brought the spirit along with the practice of persecution into this country.

We will not pause to examine the question, whether the denomination *Blue Laws* originated in the trivial circumstance that the first printed edition of them was put forth enveloped in blue colored paper, or from the fact that the laws themselves were deemed intrinsically *blue*. A partiality to the former opinion, it may be, induced the authors or publishers of the two works which we propose to review, to have the first put up in a *blue* cover, and the second printed entirely on *blue* paper; while, in confirmation of the latter opinion, it may be said that the popular acceptation of the term certainly denotes something more than the mere color of paper or covering. The skillful antiquary may, perhaps, reconcile the two opinions, by supposing that the name was originally given in consequence of the circumstance alluded to, but that afterwards it was associated in the popular mind with the peculiar nature of the laws themselves. Every philologist knows, that many words in all languages have been subject to these variations in signification. One thing is certain, that the epithet *Blue Laws* now denotes a system of legislation, marked by narrow-minded policy and proscriptive exclusiveness.

There has been manifestly a studied effort on the part of the descendants of the New England Puritans to cover up and to conceal, as far as was possible, all traces of the very peculiar legislation adopted by their forefathers. It was only after very considerable exertions and delay, that we could succeed in procuring copies of the two little works under review; a circumstance not a little remarkable, when we consider that the editions of them are comparatively recent. Whether it is that the editions were bought up by the curious almost as soon as they were issued,—which we think scarcely probable,—or that they were suppressed, or met with but little encouragement, we would not venture to say. Certain it is, that the copies are now very scarce, and that the works themselves are but little known to our booksellers, at least to those in the west and south. If we are to believe the compilers of the works under consideration, they too had great difficulty in procuring the necessary materials. The anonymous "antiquarian" to whom we owe the first publication, assures us that, of the first edition of five hundred copies, comprising the laws compiled by Governor Eaton at the instance of the general court of the New Haven colony, and printed in London in 1656, only *two* copies, so far as his researches extended, are now to be found in this country.[1] Mr. Silas Andrus, the author of the other smaller work, tells us "that the first revision of the early laws of Connecticut was never before printed;"[2] that the earliest laws of the colony were recorded only in manuscript; and that he had often the greatest difficulty in deciphering the text, "particularly for the reason that the record, in some parts, was nearly obliterated, and in others totally gone." He adds: "other parts of the record, therefore, have been resorted to, and the copy rendered complete. The ancient orthography has been accurately preserved."[3]

Both productions carry with them intrinsic evidences of laborious research, and of a sincere wish to be accurate; and we are quite sure that the compilers will receive the thanks of all who are interested in the study of the early history and antiquities of our country. All that we regret is, that the works are not gotten up in better style, that they have had apparently so limited a circulation, and that the authors had not the courage to attach their names to the title-page. Does it, then, really require so great an amount of moral courage to tell the truth, when it conflicts with popular error and prejudice?

---

[1] Preface, p 5.

[2] Preface.

[3] Ibid.

It would seem so. Thus, how very gently does not Mr. Bancroft, in his late popular History of our colonies, touch upon the eccentricities of character, and the legislative peculiarities of the pilgrim fathers! How much, and how very skillfully does he not labor to soften down, or to obliterate altogether, the shades of the historic picture! We do not venture to characterize this course as disingenuous and wholly unworthy the honest and impartial historian,—this might appear too sweeping a censure,—but we do say, that we would have admired the work of our historian much more, had he ventured to tell the *whole* truth. He cannot enter the plea of expediency; for the historian should prefer truth to expediency. He cannot plead ignorance; for he certainly must have had, spread out before him, the original records of the New England colonies, and, among others, those identical documents which are reproduced in the two works under consideration.

Besides, he might have imitated the candor, and profited by the labors, of at least three distinguished New Englanders, who had preceded him in the historical career; and who had not feared to tell the truth, and to call things by their right names. We refer to Belknap's biographical and other works; to Barber's Antiquities of New Haven; and to Peter's work on the Blue Laws. The truth seems to be, that Mr. Bancroft wrote his work quite too near Plymouth rock,—"the blarney stone of New England;" and that he sought too much to cater to the prejudices of his countrymen. We can scarcely find any other explanation of his great discretion, in regard to matters upon which he should have been more explicit and detailed. Had he been only as candid in reference to the Blue Laws, as he was in regard to the persecution of Roger Williams, of the Quakers, and of the Witches, we would have deemed these strictures wholly uncalled for. As it is, we may venture the suggestion, that the eminent historian will yet supply the deficiency we have indicated, in some future edition of his valuable work, and that he will furnish us, at least in an appendix or a note, a faithful abstract of the early colonial Blue Laws of New England. This is what we purpose to attempt in the present paper, which we might entitle,—A Chapter that *should have been* in Bancroft.

We would deem it unjust to the memory of the Puritans who settled New England, to say that they had no good qualities whatever, or even that their vices very greatly preponderated over their virtues. Faults they certainly had, faults as grievous as they were notorious and clearly marked. But they had excellencies also, which should be taken into the account in the estimate of their character. They were bold, daring, courageous, industrious, sober, enterprising, and religious after their own fashion. With an arduous mission to accomplish, they shrank not from the difficulties which encompassed them. Trained in the painful school of suffering and privation, and possessed of iron nerve, they were discouraged by no reverses, appalled by no dangers. Men of less sternness of purpose would have given up the undertaking upon which they embarked, as utterly impracticable. They, however, never lost hope of a favorable issue; and, with an elasticity of character which does them honor, they surmounted obstacles, even as a ship rides the waves which threaten to engulf it in the abyss. And they have bequeathed this same enterprising and indomitable spirit to their children.

This much we say in their praise. But when this is said, all is told. Their faults stood forth, at least as prominent as their virtues. They were narrow-minded, exclusive, proscriptive, and short-sighted in their character, and in the whole line of their conduct and policy. In temporal matters, they sacrificed every thing to their own paltry interests. Their treatment of the poor Indians who then peopled New England, is worthy of a reprobation which we can find no words in our language strong enough properly to characterize. We have already stated the facts, on the authority of Bancroft;[1] and until they can be blotted from the pages of history, we must be excused from entertaining that lofty opinion of the Puritan character, which our Fourth-of-July orators, and Plymouth-rock-anniversary declaimers would fain wish to thrust on us. These fulsome eulogists must give us fuller and fairer statements of facts, ere we can change our opinion of the pilgrim fathers, or regard their glowing representations as a faithful picture of the real character of those men. We must have the shades, as well as the lights of the picture. We must have an account of the Blue Laws, of the Quaker Laws, of the Witch Laws—of the stocks, of the whipping-posts, and of the branding-irons;—as well as of the pure religious feelings, and of the lofty patriotic aspirations of the pilgrim fathers.

We must be told that, whereas they fled from the old world for the avowed purpose of escaping a grinding *Protestant* persecution, and of breathing, in a virgin hemisphere, the pure air of religious liberty, they notwithstanding had no sooner established themselves in their new homes, than they boldly set to work to establish odious religious tests, to enforce religious uniformity, to persecute and to drive into the wilderness brother *Protestants* who had the misfortune to interpret the Scriptures differently from themselves; to banish, to hang, to brand, or to bore with red hot irons the tongues of the inoffensive Quakers; to hunt up and exterminate the poor witches; and to enact the Blue Laws. Really, we can be satisfied with nothing less; and though the Plymouth orators may make wry faces, and protest loudly against taking a medicine so very unpalatable, they should still take it like men, if they be the lovers of historic truth.

The days of idle declamation and of overstrained or false eulogy are, we fondly hope, drawing to a close, and those of sober truth are beginning to dawn upon us. Men now-a-days will not be satisfied with any thing less than the truth, and the whole truth, just such as genuine history unfolds it: and if, under this process, phantoms which we have conjured up for our own special entertainment should vanish, or if visions of ancestral glory should disappear altogether, or be brought down to the standard of sober reality, still the whole truth must be boldly and fearlessly told. Only those who are laboring to bolster up a bad cause can fear the truth; and the time has come when even the children of the Puritans must nerve themselves to look the facts boldly in the face.

---

[1] In the Review of Webster's Bunker Hill Speech.

Nor let us be told, that the faults to which we allude were but blemishes in the otherwise stainless character of the pilgrim fathers. We know that this has been often said, and that it is even fashionable to repeat it; but it is not the more true for all this. To every reasonable and impartial man it must appear manifest, that the charges we prefer against the early colonists of New England, embrace something more than mere trifles and peccadilloes; something more than mere peculiarities and eccentricities; something, in a word, which deeply involves the very substance of their moral and religious character. Was it a mere trifle to hang witches, to hang Quakers, to drive out brother Protestants, to butcher Indians? Was it, even, a mere trifle to adopt a system of vexatious legislation, which established a harassing espionage over a man's most trivial actions, which prescribed the cut of the hair, the fashion of the dress, and the particular occasions on which mothers might with impunity kiss their children, or wives their husbands? Were all these things, and many more of a similar character, mere blemishes?

We think not; and we are of opinion that all our readers will agree with us in opinion, if they will only have the patience to examine those peculiarities of legislation, an abstract of which we will now proceed to lay before them. We shall state nothing, which has not been taken from authentic records by the two writers, to whose works we have called attention, or which cannot be substantiated by other undoubted collateral authorities. And as the first work on our list comprises nearly all that is contained in the second, we may as well admonish our readers that our quotations shall be mainly taken from its pages.

The Blue Laws of New England may be distributed into two classes: the first comprising those connected with religion; and the second, those which regarded secular matters. We will present several curious specimens of legislation under each of these classes, from the various codes republished in the volumes before us. The laws in question were enacted by the General Courts of the different plantations in successive years; and of the Codes embracing them, that of the Plymouth or Massachusetts colony is the oldest, dating back as far as 1638, but that of New Haven, drawn up by Governor Eaton, and printed in 1656, is by far the *bluest*. The latter seems to have been derived, with various additions and *improvements*, from the former. A striking similarity both in principles and in language pervades all the early New England Codes; and to avoid needless repetition, we shall quote sometimes from one collection and sometimes from another, presenting whatever may be considered most striking.

1. Religion was a prominent feature in the whole system of New England legislation. Every Code which we have examined is based upon the doctrine of a union of church and state, and contains provisions rigidly enforcing religious conformity. Crimes against religion were punished by civil penalties always rigid, sometimes wantonly cruel. The pilgrim fathers had been the victims of the same principle in the old world; still they took most special care to re-establish it forthwith in the new. They required every one to come up to their own peculiar standard of orthodoxy, and to believe neither more nor less than themselves. A complete theocracy, modified in its development according to times, places, and circumstances, appears to have been the cardinal principle, and the darling idea of all the founders of New England. If it be not historically true, — as some one has stated it to be,— that "they agreed to take the law of God for their guidance until they could *make a better*," it is at least certain, that they attempted to revive the antiquated system of theocratic government unfolded in the books of Moses, and that they even, in many instances, added to its rigor.

The following laws are predicated on the principle of religious conformity, or of union of church and state:

> "Whosoever shall frequently neglect the public worship of God on the Lord's day, *that is approved by this government*, shall forfeit for every such default convicted of, ten shillings, especially where it appears to arise from negligence, idleness, or profaneness of spirit." (Laws of the Plymouth colony.)[1]
>
> "Every person in this jurisdiction, *according to the mind of God*, shall duly resort and attend worship upon the Lord's day at least, and upon public fasting or thanksgiving days, and if any person, without just cause, absent or withdraw from the same, he shall for every such sinful miscarriage forfeit five shillings." (Laws of New Haven colony.)[2]
>
> "It is ordered, that if any Christian (so called) shall within this jurisdiction behave himself contemptuously towards the word of God preached, or any member thereof called and faithfully dispensing the same in any congregation, either by interrupting him in his preaching, *or falsely charging him with errour*, to the disparagement and hindrance of the work of God in his hands, (Acts xiii. 10 *with Bena his note upon it*) every such person or persons shall be duly punished either by the plantation court, or court of magistrates, according to the quality and measure of the offence, that all others may fear to break out into such wickednesse." (Gov. Eaton's Laws.)[3]

This same principle is carried out in a variety of details, which our limits do not allow us to furnish; but we can not refrain from quoting two other passages in Gov. Eaton's Collection, which distinctly and boldly avow the doctrine itself. They are taken from the "fundamental agreement," of the plantations composing the New Haven colony; and their estimated importance may be inferred from the fact, that the first is taken from the very beginning of the agreement itself, and the second is the first fundamental law on the list of articles subjoined to that instrument:

---

[1] Blue Laws, &c., p. 55.
[2] Ibid. p. 127.
[3] Ibid. p. 176.

> "That none shall be admitted freemen, or free burgesses, within this jurisdiction, or any part of it, but such planters *as are members of some one or other of the approved churches of New England;* nor shall any such be chosen to magistracy, or to carry on any part of civil jurisdiction, or as deputies or assistants to have power, or vote in establishing laws, or in making or repealing orders, or to any chief military office or trust, nor shall any others *but some such church members* have any vote in any such elections, though all others admitted to be planters have right to their proper inheritances, and doe and shall enjoy all other civil liberties and priviledges according to all laws, orders, or grants, which on (are?), or hereafter shall be made for this colony."[1]
>
> "1. This court thus framed, shall first, with all care and diligence, from time to time, provide for the maintainance of the *purity* of religion, *and suppress the contrary,* according to their best light and directions *from the word of God.*"[2]

To these we will add the following provisions, likewise contained in Gov. Eaton's Code:

> "22. All the people of God within this jurisdiction, who are not in church way, *being orthodox in judgment,* shall have liberty to gather themselves to a church estate. (1656.)
>
> "23. No man shall be admitted to the *freedom* of this jurisdiction, who is not a member of some church in New England, approved by the magistrates and churches of this colony." (New Haven Colony Laws, 1656.)[3]

The following law, passed by the General Court convened at Hartford in 1650, though it is couched in language very similar to that of one already quoted, is so curious that we cannot refrain from giving it entire. After a suitable preamble, the Court says:

> "It is therefore ordered and decreed: That if any Christian (so called) within this jurisdiction, shall contemptuously behave himselfe towards the word preached or the messengers thereof, called to dispence the same in any congregation when he doth faithfully execute his service and office therein, *according to the will and mind of God,* either by interrupting him in his preaching, or by charging him falsely with an error w'h he hath not thought in the open face of the church, or like a sonne of Korah, cast upon his true doctrine, or himselfe any reproach, to the dishonour of the Lord Jesus who hath sent him, and to the disparagement of that his holy ordinance, and making God's wayes contemptible and ridiculous, that every such person or persons (whatsoever censure the church may passe) shall for the first scandal be convented and reproved openly by the magistrates at some lecture, and bound to their good behavoour. And if a second time they breake forth in the like contemptuous carriages, they shall pay either five pounds to the publique treasury or stand two houres openly vpon a block or stoole four foott high vpon a lecture day, with a paper fixed on his breast, written with capitalle letters, AN OPEN AND OBSTINATE CONTEMNER OF GOD'S HOLY ORDINANCE, that others may feare and be ashamed of breaking out into the like wickednesse."[4]

Closely connected with this branch of the subject, are the Laws regulating the observance of the holy Sabbath day. These were surely *blue* enough. They would have suited the taste of the Jews, even of the sneering Pharisees, who were for ever blaming our blessed Lord himself for his alleged violations of the holy Sabbath day! The Puritans had very erroneous, or at least very highly exaggerated notions in regard to the Sabbath; notions which, though manifestly more Jewish than Christian, they have faithfully transmitted to their posterity. The Plymouth Code contains the following enactment:

---

[1] Ibid. p. 142.
[2] Ibid. p. 145.
[3] Ibid. p. 127–8.
[4] Ibid. p. 107–8.

"This court taking notice of the great abuse and many misdemeanours committed by divers persons in these many ways, profaneing the Sabbath or Lord's day, to the great dishonour of God, reproach of religion, and grief of the spirit of God's people, Do, therefore, order, that whosoever shall profane the Lord's day, by doing unnecessary servile work, by unnecessary travailing, or by sports and recreations, he or they that so transgress, shall forfeit for every such default forty shillings, *or be publicly whipt*; but if it clearly appear that sin was proudly, presumptuously, and with a high hand committed, against the known command and authority of the blessed God, such a person therein despising and reproaching the Lord, SHALL BE PUT TO DEATH, or grievously punished at the discretion of the court."[1]

This law was re-enacted, in similar language, by the colonies of New Haven and Hartford, with the addition of the appropriate scriptural references![2] Sabbath breaking was one of the highest offences known to the laws; and the legislators descended to the most minute, and even ridiculous details on the subject. Take the following specimens from the collection of Barber and Peters, which comprise laws before unpublished, and anterior to those contained in the printed Code of Gov. Eaton:

"21. No one shall run on the Sabbath day, or walk in his garden, or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting." (Barber.)

"22. No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair, or shave, on the Sabbath day." (Barber.)

"23. *No woman shall kiss her child* on the Sabbath or fasting day." (Barber.)

"24. The Sabbath shall begin *at sunset* on Saturday."[3]

To these add the following singular law taken from Gov. Eaton's Code;

"38. If any man *shall kiss his wife* or *wife her husband on the Lord's day*, the party in fault, shall be punished at the discretion of the court of magistrates."[4]

To this the author of the work from which we are quoting appends the following note:

"Tradition says, a gentleman of New Haven, after an absence of some months, reached home on the Sabbath, and meeting his wife at his door, kissed her with an appetite, and for *his temerity in violating this law*, the next day was arraigned before the court, and fined, for so *palpable* a breach of the law on the Lord's day."

This reminds us of another law, said to be contained in a collection which we have not seen, by which it was prohibited to brew beer on Saturday, lest it should *work*, and thus violate the Sabbath on the following day! And of another regulation, in which the proprietors of bees were required to close the orifices of the hives on Saturday evening *before sunset*, lest the industrious little insects should be guilty of Sabbath breaking! We do not, however, vouch for the accuracy of either of these regulations; though we are persuaded, that there were many such laws in existence which were never published, and the memory of which was preserved only by tradition.

---

[1] Ibid. p. 55.

[2] Ibid. p. 206, et alibi.

[3] Ibid. p. 122.

[4] Ibid. p. 180.

In all the early Codes of New England, blasphemy was punished with death, and profane swearing with the most severe penalties. The laws on these subjects, especially those of Connecticut, were flanked with abundant references to Scripture; and it was a settled maxim, that, where the colonial law could not reach a particular case, it should be decided on by the law of God. Thus Gov. Eaton's Code contains the provision subjoined:

> "40. No man's life shall be taken away, honor or good name shall be stained, his person imprisoned, banished, or punished, deprived of his wife or children, or property taken, unless by virtue or equity of some express law established by the general court, and published: and *for want of a law in any particular case, shall be judged by the word of God.* (1656.)
>
> "41. All capital causes, concerning life, or banishment, *if there is no express law, shall be judged according to the word and law of God*, by the generall court."[1] (1656.)

As for Roman Catholics, they might expect no toleration, and little mercy from people so peculiarly *holy*. The following is found among the Blue Laws of Connecticut:

> "10. No priest shall abide in this dominion: he shall be banished and SUFFER DEATH on his return. Priests may be seized by any one without a warrant."[2] (In force before 1656.)

We conclude this portion of the subject with the following singular specimens of legal cant, sanctimoniousness, and *acumen*:

> "36. No one shall read Common Prayer, keep Christmas, or saints' days, *make minced pies, dance, play cards, or play on any instrument of*

---

[1] Ibid. p. 130.

[2] Ibid. p. 121. In many of the other colonies the Catholics fared little better. In New York city, a Catholic priest was publicly hanged for his religion! In relation to the legislation of the colony of New York, Chancellor Kent says:

"Before the adoption of the present constitution of the United States, the power of naturalization resided in the several states; and the constitution of this state, as it was originally passed (Art. 42), required all persons born out of the United States, and naturalized by our legislature, to take an oath abjuring all foreign allegiance and subjection, in all matters, *ecclesiastical* as well as civil. This was intended, and so it operated, to exclude from the benefits of naturalization Roman Catholics, who acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, and it was the result of former fears and prejudices (still alive and active at the commencement of our revolution) respecting the religion of the Romish (!) church, which European history had taught (!) us to believe was incompatible with perfect national independence, or the freedom and good order of civil society. So extremely strong, and so astonishingly fierce and unrelenting was public prejudice on this subject, in the early part of our colonial history, that we find it declared by law in the early part of the last century (Colony laws, vol. i, p. 38, Livingston's and Smith's edition), that every Jesuit and popish priest, who should continue in the colony after a given day, should be condemned *to perpetual imprisonment*; and if he broke prison and escaped, and was retaken, *he should be put to death.* That law, said Mr. Smith, the historian of the colony, as late as 1756 (Smith's History of New York, p. 111), was worthy of perpetual duration!"—*Commentaries on American Law*, vol. ii, pp. 62–3. *New York*, 1827.

music, except the drum, trumpet, and jewsharp." (Barber. Blue Laws of Connecticut.)[1]

"1662. The court proposeth it as a thing they judge would be very commendable to the townes where God's providence shall cast any whales, if they should agree to set apart some p'te of every such fish or oyle *for the incouragement of an able and godly minister amongst them.*" (Blue Laws of Mass.)[2]

"For the prevention of the profanation of the Lord's day, it is enacted by the court and the authoritie thereof, that the select men of the severall townes of this jurisdiction, or any one of them, may or shall, as there may be occasion, take with him the constable or his deputie, and repair to any house or place where *they may suspect* that any slothfully doe lurke att hom or gett together in companie to neglect the publicke worship of God, or profane the Lord's day, and finding any such disorder, shall returne the names of the p'sons to the next court, and give notice of any particular miscarriage they may have taken notice of," &c. (Id.)[3]

II. Such were some of the principal features in the religious portion of the Blue Laws of New England. We will now furnish some examples of such laws as regarded civil matters. And it will be seen, at a glance, that the same narrow-minded, exclusive, and proscriptive spirit pervaded the whole of that most singular system of legislation.

The Criminal Code was peculiarly rigid and unmerciful. It multiplied capital offences beyond all the bounds of mercy or reason. Not only idolatry and blasphemy, but also sins against purity, rape, and sudden homicide, were punished with death. In the Code of Connecticut, adultery was also visited with the same penalty.[4] And all the laws under this head are duly confirmed by references to the law of Moses; as if the law of Moses had not been abrogated by Christ! We subjoin a few among the more curious of these laws:

"6. If any person slayeth another *suddenly in anger* and cruelty of passion; he shall be put to death." (Blue Laws of Mass.)[5]

"25. If any man have a stubborn, rebellious son of 16 years old, who will not obey the voyce of his father or mother, and being chastened, will not hearken unto them, then shall his father and mother, lay hold on him, and bring him to the magistrates assembled in court, and testifie unto them, that their son is stubborne and rebellious, and will not obey their voyce, but lives in sundry crimes: SUCH A SON SHALL BE PUT TO DEATH." Deut. xxi, 18, 19, 20, 21. Enacted 1656. (Blue Laws of New Haven colony.)[6]

"Whoever setts a fire in the woods, and it burns a house, SHALL SUFFER DEATH; and persons *suspected* of this crime shall be imprisoned *without benefit of bail.*" (Blue Laws of Connecticut.)[7]

For crimes not capital by the laws, the most severe and cruel punishments were often awarded. The rack, the stocks, the whipping-post, and the branding-iron, were not unfrequently put in requisition. Take the following laws as specimens:

"9. If any person commit burglary, or rob any person, *he shall be branded on the right hand with the letter* B; for second offence, *shall be*

---

[1] Ibid. p. 123.
[2] Ibid. p. 48.
[3] Ibid pp. 49, 50.
[4] Ibid. p. 128.
[5] Ibid p. 52.
[6] Page 128. See the same law in Massachusetts, p. 53.
[7] Page 122.

branded on his left hand, and whipt, and for the third offence, he shall be put to death. Judg. xviii, 7." (Blue Laws of New Haven.)[1]

"When it appears that an accused has confederates, and he refuses to discover them, he may be *racked.*" (Blue Laws of Conn.)[2]

"30. Whoever publishes a lie to the prejudice of his neighbour, *shall sit in the stocks, or be whipped fifteen stripes.*" (Id.)[3]

"And if any person shall commit such burglary, or so rob in any place on the Lord's day, he shall (besides restitution and damage) for the first offence *be burnt on the right hand as before, and severely whipt;* for the second offence, *he shall be burnt on the left hand, stand on the pillory, be severely whipt, and wear a halter in the day time constantly and visibly about his neck*, as a mark of infamy, till the court of magistrates see cause to release him from it," &c. (Blue Laws of New Haven.)[4]

The following singular laws may be classed under the head *miscellaneous.* We venture to say that no system of legislation that was ever devised, either before or since, can present anything half so curious.

It would seem that, in Massachusetts, Indians and wolves were classified under the same genus! In 1675 it was

"Ordered by the court, that whosoever shall shoot off any gun on any unnecessarie occation, or att any game whatsoever, EXCEPT ATT AN INDIAN OR A WOOLFE, shall forfeit five shillings for every such shott, till further libertie shall be given."[5]

The good pilgrims seem to have had a mortal aversion for tobacco. Among the many laws on this most important subject, we select the two which follow:

"1640. That if any person take tobacco whilst they are empannelled upon a jurie, to forfeit five shillings for every default, except they have given up their verdict, or are not to give yt until the next day, or dep't the court by consent." (Blue Laws of Mass.)[6]

"It is enacted by the court, that any p'son or p'sons that shall be found smoaking tobacco on the Lord's day, going to or coming from the meetings, *within two miles of the meeting house*, shall pay twelve pence for every such default to the colonie's use." (Id.)[7]

There were many laws regulating the attire both of males and of females, the fashions, and even the cut of the hair! Thus, our author tells us, that

"There was an ancient law in Massachusetts, that ladies' dresses should be made so long as to hide their shoe buckles, and in 1630 there was an act of the general court also prohibiting short sleeves, and requiring garments to be lengthened so as to cover the arms to the wrists, and gowns to the shoe buckles; (also) 'immoderate great breeches, knots of ribin, broad shoulder bands, and they be, silk roses, double ruffs and cuffs.' In the same colony, in 1653, J. Fairbanks was tried for wearing *great boots*, but was acquitted."[8]

Among the Blue Laws of Connecticut, we find the following on this subject:

"33. Whoever wears clothes trimmed with gold, silver, or bone lace, *above two shillings by the yard*, shall be presented by the grand jurors, and the selectmen shall tax the offender at £300 estate." (Several acts governing the attire of the subjects.)[1]

---

[1] Page 126.
[2] Page 123.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Page 156.
[5] Page 50.
[6] Page 44
[7] Page 49.
[8] Pages 131-2.

"44. Every male shall have his hair *cut round* according *to a cap*." (Barber and Peters.)[2]

To these our author appends the following note, by way of explanation:

"A cap to go round the head was used, drawn close to the head, and the hair cut by the cap. A pumpkin severed in the middle, and placed on the head, was often used as a substitute for a cap, in the season of them, as tradition says! The Levitical laws forbid cutting the hair or rounding the head."[3]

The subjoined Blue Laws of Connecticut, taken chiefly from the collections of Peters and Barber, regard different other subjects, and may speak for themselves:

"20. No one to cross a river, but with an authorized ferryman. (Barber.)

"25. To pick an ear of corn growing in a neighbour's garden shall be deemed theft.

"26. A person accused of trespass in the night shall be judged guilty, unless he clear himself by his oath.

"28. No one shall buy or sell lands without permission of the selectmen.

"29. A drunkard shall have a master appointed by the selectmen, who are to debar him from the liberty of buying and selling.

"31. No minister shall keep a school. (Barber.)

"32. Every rateable person, who refuses to pay his proportion to the support of the minister of the town or parish, shall be fined by the court £2, and £4 every quarter, until he or she pay the rate to the minister. (Other acts to enforce collection of parochial taxes.)

"34. A debtor in prison, swearing he has no estate, shall be let out AND SOLD TO MAKE SATISFACTION. (Altered in 1656.)

"37. No Gospel minister shall join people in marriage. The magistrates only shall join people in marriage, as they may do it with less scandal to Christ's church. (Barber.) This law was amended by the court in 1694.

"39. The selectmen finding children ignorant, may take them from their parents, and place them in better hands, at the expense of their parents. (Record.)

"41. A wife shall be deemed good evidence against her husband.

"42. Married persons must live together, or be imprisoned.

"43. No man shall court a maid in person or by letter, without first obtaining the consent of her parents; £5 penalty for the first offence; £10 for the second; and for the third, imprisonment during the pleasure of the court."[4]

In the following enactment by the General Court of Massachusetts, we may discover the germ of the odious sedition law proposed by the elder John Adams:

"It is ordered, that whosoever shall defame any court of justice, or any of the magistrates or judges of any court in this jurisdiction, in respect of any act or decision therein passed; every such offender, upon due proof made, shall be by the court of magistrates punished by fine, imprisonment, binding to the peace or good behaviour, according to the guilt and measure of the offence or disturbance, to them seeming just and equal."[5]

---

[1] Page 123. [2] Page 124. [3] Ibid. [4] Pp. 122-4. [5] Pp 55-6.

In regard to the indissolubility of the marriage contract, the good pilgrims held opinions not half so rigid as on other points of much less importance. Bible in hand, they allowed of divorce, with the privilege of marrying again, for mere desertion; as appears from the following law of the New Haven colony:

> "And it is further declared that if any husband shall, without consent, just cause shewn, wilfully desert his wife, or the wife her husband, actually and peremptorily refusing all matrimonial society, and shall obstinately persist therein, after due means have been used to convince and reclaim, the husband or wife, so deserted, may justly seek and expect help and relief, according to 1 Cor. vii, 15; and the court, upon satisfying evidence thereof, may not hold the innocent party under bondage."[1]

It is singular enough, that when "the New England Eliot" and his Reverend associates attempted to evangelize the savage tribes around Boston, they could devise no better laws for their government than those comprised in the Blue Law Code. The poor Indians were to be civilized by a system of trivial, ridiculous, and harassing enactments, the absurdity of which their native good sense must have detected at a glance. The historian of the Protestant missions frankly admits, that "some of the regulations were frivolous enough, and certainly had better been omitted;" but he adds, in mitigation, "let it be remembered that every age has its follies."[2]

Among these regulations occur the following, which we give as specimens:

> "If any woman shall not have her hair tied up, but shall allow it to hang loose and to be cut as men's hair, she shall pay five shillings. If any man wear long hair, he shall pay five shillings."[3]

No wonder the efforts to convert and civilize the Indians of New England were so unsuccessful, and finally led to no practical good result. The method adopted by the Protestant missionaries was calculated rather to repel than to attract the savages; and, besides, the blessing of God did not smile on their labors!

We might greatly multiply our quotations, but those we have already furnished are deemed sufficient to show the distinctive features in the Blue Law system of legislation. Was there ever such a system heard of, either before or since? Was there ever one more wantonly cruel in many of its enactments, or more vexatious in its minute details? We believe that it is wholly without a parallel, at least in Christian times.

And, be it remembered, those laws were not enacted in a dark age, but nearly a century and a half after the light of the blessed reformation had been beaming full upon the world! They were enacted, too, by men who boasted of their own superior religious lights, and who set themselves apart from the rest of the world as *Puritans*, or peculiarly *pure* and holy; by men who had the Bible forever at their tongues' ends, and who were always vaunting their reverence for its sacred principles of love and mercy; by men with long faces and sanctimonious appearance, who gave themselves forth as models of righteousness; by men, too, who had just escaped the lash of religious persecution, inflicted on them *by brother Protestants* in Europe, and who should have learned more enlarged and liberal principles in the rough school of suffering! These men are held up by their posterity as the very paragons of perfection; and yet their *public* acts exhibit them in a different light altogether.

---

[1] P. 174.

[2] History of Missions, or of the Propagation of Christianity among the heathen since the reformation. By Rev. William Brown. 2 vols. 8 vo. Philadelphia, 1816.

Among the frivolous regulations, he enumerates the following: "Whoever shall kill their lice between their teeth, shall pay five shillings!"

[3] Ibid.

But the Blue Laws have been modified or repealed. True; but no thanks are due to the Puritans for the better system of legislation which now obtains in New England. The amelioration was forced on them by circumstances of imperative necessity; by circumstances which it would have been vain in them to have attempted either to resist or to control. It was surely no merit of theirs, that the odious principle of a union of church and state was annulled. The constant influx of European emigration, of persons belonging to all sects, or to no sect, soon left them in the minority, and compelled them to return to more liberal principles. The abrogation of the Blue Laws, we repeat it, was brought about not *by* the Puritans, but *in spite* of the Puritans.

Nor let us be told, that they did but act out the principles of their age; and that they were not alone in narrow-mindedness. Even if it were so, it would scarcely be a valid apology for men, of whom we are constantly informed that they were in advance of their age. The truth is, they *were* in advance of their age; but it was in selfishness, in intolerance, and in bigotry. There were Blue Laws in many of the other colonies, but they were few, and exceptions to the general order of things; New England was the very paradise of Blue Laws,—the soil in which they were indigenous, and in which they flourished most. We look in vain for a large collection of such laws, even in the Protestant colonies of New York, Virginia, and South Carolina, in all of which, however, principles of proscription for conscience sake were openly avowed and occasionally acted on. We could easily establish this, by giving a brief summary of the various Blue Laws enacted by those colonies, as furnished us by our anonymous "Antiquarian." But our narrow limits will not allow us, at present, to go into the comparison; nor do we deem it at all necessary to do so. All who have ever glanced at the distinctive characteristics of our early colonial legislation, will readily admit that New England was manifestly *in advance* of all the other sections of the country in all that was *blue* and fanatical. In all this she stood alone and unrivaled.[1]

---

[1] We have not space to enumerate the various Blue Laws of the other colonies. We present the following early laws of Virginia, as a specimen of them:

In March. 1623, it was enacted by the general assembly of Virginia, "that whosoever shall absent himselfe from divine service any Sunday without an allowable excuse, shall forfeite a pound of tobacco, and he that absenteth himselfe a month shall forfeite fifty pounds of tobacco."

It was further enacted, "that no minister be absent from his church, above two months in all the yeare, upon penalty of forfeiting halfe his means, and whosoever shall be absent above foure months in the yeare shall forfeite his whole means and cure."

"That no man dispose of any of his tobacco before the minister be satisfied, upon pain of forfeiture

By the way, the land of "steady habits" does not appear to have been half so *steady* in olden times, as it has the reputation of being at present. We find the Blue Law legislators continually inveighing against the frightful prevalence of drunkenness in their new land of promise, and enacting the most rigid laws for its suppression. And if we are to believe the account of a cotemporary Dutch traveler, who visited the plantations on the Connecticut river in 1638–9, they had abundant reason for the rigor of their enactments. He says of the colonists:

> "The English here live sober. They drink only *three times* every meal, and those that become drunk are whipped on a pole, as the thieves in Holland."[1]

To the eternal honor of the noble Catholic Colony of Maryland be it said, that there were no Blue Laws there so long as Catholics retained the ascendency. The legislation was, indeed, *blue* enough, so soon as Protestants seized on the reins of government. At that time, even those who had been the first on this continent to give to the breeze the glorious banner of universal freedom, both civil and religious, became themselves the victims of a most intolerant and cruel legislation, devised by those, too, whom they had sheltered and protected![2]

This subject is so interesting to the Christian and to the American antiquary, that we shall probably revert to it, and dwell at some length on the persecutions of *Protestants* in New England, and on the hanging of Quakers and witches by the *enlightened* Puritans.

---

of double his part of the minister's means, and one man of every plantation to collect his means out of the first and best tobacco and corn."

There were also in this colony, if we remember aright, certain laws about "ducking a gossiping and scolding wife," and fining the unfortunate husband a certain number of pounds of tobacco, if his wife was too free with her tongue! The gallantry of the old dominion has, however, long since expunged these odious regulations, so very revolting to the dignity, and infringing so cruelly on the most cherished privileges of the sex!

[1] From his Journal, given by our author, p. 120.

[2] See Bancroft's History, vol. i, Maryland.

XX. OUR COLONIAL BLUE LAWS.*

ARTICLE II.—HERETICS, QUAKERS, AND WITCHES.

Two characteristics of the Puritans—Scenting out heresy and witchcraft—Preaching and practice—Consistency—Which colony deserves the palm—Roger Williams—His principles and banishment—Laws against Quakers—How executed—A strong protest—How answered—Persecution avowed and proved from the Bible—Witchcraft in New England—Why so prevalent there—Exposition of Cotton Mather—Shrewdness of the witches—How they were exterminated—"Eight firebrands of hell"—Hanging first, and trying afterwards—Humorous passage from Irving.

For two things were the good pilgrim fathers especially remarkable: their hatred of heresy, and their mortal aversion to witches. Wo to the bold man, who, during the good old days of Puritanism in New England, dared to think for himself in matters of religion; if, while enjoying this privilege, he unfortunately differed in opinion from the majority then wielding power. Wo to him if he chanced not to be orthodox for the time being; that is, not so rigidly Calvinistic as his brethren. He was sure to become the victim of a most relentless persecution; and, if he escaped with sound ears, or an unbored tongue, or even with his life, he might deem himself a very lucky man. And as to the luckless wizard, who, at that *enlightened* period, dared wave his mystic wand of incantation; or the haggard old witch, who, toothless and lustreless, and mounted on her broom-stick, ventured to perform her stated aerial evolutions, "to sweep the cobwebs from the sky;"—they were placed entirely without the pale of society; they were outlawed, and no more mercy was shown them than to the very imps of Satan, who, it was devoutly believed, bodily inhabited their persons!

The pilgrim fathers were certainly excellent heresy-hunters. They could detect the lurking infection in a twinkling. They could discover beams in the eyes of their neighbors, in which others, less keen-sighted, could scarcely have perceived motes. And as for withcraft, they could scent it from afar, probably in consequence of the strong odor of brimstone which it usually gave out; and they could tell, to a nicety, its exact symptoms and *diagnosis*, with as much facility and certainty, as a physician can tell the disease of his patient, by feeling his pulse, and examining his tongue. But, unlike the skillful physician, and like the empiric, they had but one remedy for the cure of the malady; a remedy, however, at once very simple and very efficacious,—the halter. This medicine was never known to fail in effectually subduing the most obstinate case of witchcraft!

---

* I. *The Blue Laws of New Haven Colony, usually called the Blue Laws of Connecticut; Quaker Laws of Plymouth and Massachusetts; Blue Laws of New York, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina. First Record of Connecticut; interesting extracts from Connecticut Records; cases of Salem witchcraft; charges and banishment of Rev. Roger Williams, &c., and other interesting and instructive antiquities. Compiled by an Antiquarian.* Hartford: Printed by Case, Tiffany & Co. 1838. 1 vol. 12mo. pp. 336.

II. *The Code of* 1656*; being a compilation of the earliest Laws and Orders of the General Court of Connecticut: also, the Constitution, or civil compact entered into and adopted by the towns of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield, in* 1638-9. *To which are added some extracts from the laws and judicial proceedings of the New Haven Colony, commonly called Blue Laws.* Hartford: Judd, Loomis & Co. 1836. 1 vol. 16mo., pp. 119.

It would, indeed, appear that the Puritans who peopled New England should have learned some mercy and toleration, in the severe school of suffering in which they had been trained up in *Protestant* England. It would seem that, having felt the smart of the rod of persecution on their own shoulders, they should have been very slow in applying it to the shoulders of others. Having emigrated to a new world for the enjoyment of the inestimable blessings of religious liberty; having braved, for this high and noble motive, the unknown perils of a boundless ocean, and the untried hardships and dangers of a frightful wilderness in a new world; they were surely not going to re-assert the very same intolerant principle, to which they had been indebted for all their past trials and sufferings. They were surely not going to set up again, in a virgin hemisphere yet unstained with the blood of the martyr, that very Moloch which had consumed their fathers, and had threatened themselves with a fiery death. If they were really sincere and consistent in their principles, they would certainly have done for ever with all kinds of persecution, no matter what might be the pretext for it; and they would have given to the breeze the glorious banner of universal civil and religious liberty.

But, alas for the weakness and inconsistency of poor human nature! These, our reasonable anticipations, are all doomed to utter disappointment, and we find the Puritans, who, in England and in Holland, were the loudest champions of the fullest liberty of conscience, become themselves, *immediately* after their arrival in America, the most stern and relentless persecutors! We find them setting up on our continent that very principle of church and state in which all their wrongs had originated, and lording it over the consciences of their fellow-men, with as high a hand as ever the haughty church of England had lorded it over themselves! Were they sincere, were they honest in all this? Or were they merely weak and inconsistent? Were they hypocrites, or were they mere blind fanatics? We venture not to decide. But of one thing we are quite certain;—they were not the immaculate *saints* they are usually represented to have been.

The inimitable Washington Irving thus humorously hits off their canting inconsistency and hypocrisy in the matter of persecution:

> "Having served a regular apprenticeship in the school of persecution, it behoved them to show that they had become proficients in the art. They accordingly employed their leisure hours in banishing, scourging, or

hanging divers heretical Papists, Quakers, and Anabaptists, for daring to abuse the *liberty of conscience*, which they now clearly proved to imply nothing more than that every man should think as he pleased in matters of religion, *provided* he thought *right*, for otherwise it would be giving a [illegible] to damnable heresies. Now as they (the majority) were perfectly [illegible] that *they alone* thought *right*, it consequently followed that whoever thought differently from them thought wrong, and whoever thought wrong, and obstinately persisted in not being convinced and converted, was a flagrant violator of the inestimable liberty of conscience, and a corrupt and infectious member of the body politic, and deserved to be lopped off and cast into the fire."[1]

In the matter of the Blue Laws proper, we must award the palm of excellence to Connecticut; but in the matter of scourging, branding, banishing, or hanging heretics and witches, we must certainly assign the precedency to Massachusetts. Whether it was, that there were more heretics and witches in the latter colony, or that the hardy pioneers of the former had become more civilized, and their hearts softer in consequence of their greater proximity to the Indians, certain it is that the adventurous "moss troopers," who inhabited the plantations on the Connecticut river, are not recorded to have actually hung any witches or heretics; though they had severe laws against both, and though they more than once put both in bodily terror. On the contrary, the unadulterated and unmitigated Puritans of Massachusetts were not satisfied with mere laws on paper, or with mere empty threats; they went boldly to work to rid the country, —given by the Lord "as an inheritance to his *saints*," —of all the *pests*, which tainted its moral and religious atmosphere by their poisonous breath. No one could be either a heretic or a witch in Massachusetts, and live. The colony was too *holy* by far for any such wretches, and they must either die the death, or seek from the savage of the unexplored wilderness that mercy, which they sought in vain from their *Christian* brethren! So blind and unfeeling is bigotry!

It was thus that the famous Roger Williams was driven forth,—to say nothing of the treatment of Richard Waterman, of Ann Hutchinson, and of a number of other "pestilent heretics" of Massachusetts. And what were the offenses which drew down upon Roger Williams the terrible chastisement, of being driven out into the wilderness in the dead of winter,[2] there to find shelter from the savages, or to perish of hunger and cold? The following are the weighty charges preferred against him in the General Court, held July 8th, 1635:

That he held these "*dangerous opinions:* 1. That the magistrate ought not to punish the breach of the first table, otherwise than in such cases as did disturb the civil peace. 2. That he ought not to tender an oath to an unregenerate man. 3. That a man ought not to pray with such, though wife, children, &c. 4. That a man ought not to give thanks after sacrament, nor after meals."[1]

---

[1] History of New York. Irving's works, in two volumes, 8vo. Philadelphia, 1840. Vol. i, p. 78.

[2] Sentence of banishment was passed on him in October, 1635; and the court *mercifully* allowed him to remain in the colony till the following spring, on condition of his not disseminating his doctrines; yet it became necessary for Williams to fly in the following January, as he learned that his accusers were about sending him to England for trial and punishment.

The first article was evidently the main ground of difficulty. The Puritans asserted, and Roger Williams denied, that the civil magistrate had any right to punish mere religious delinquencies, or "breaches of the first table" of the commandments, embracing the duties we owe to God, unless such delinquencies should disturb "the civil peace." The Puritans asserted, and Roger Williams protested against, the principle of a union of church and state. The Puritans asserted the right in the state to enforce religious conformity; Roger Williams protested against that right. The Puritans triumphed, and so did Roger Williams; *they* drove him out, and *he*, when driven out, became the founder of a new colony, which he moulded according to his own liberal principles.

We subjoin the sentence of banishment pronounced against him, as a curious specimen of colonial jurisprudence:

"Whereas Mr. Roger Williams, one of the elders of the church of Salem, hath broached and divulged divers *new and dangerous opinions against the authority of magistrates*, as also written letters of defamation both of magistrates and churches here, and that before any conviction, and yet maintaineth the same without retraction; it is therefore ordered that the said Mr. Williams shall depart out of this jurisdiction within six weeks now next ensuing, which, if he neglects to perform, it shall be lawful for the governor and two of the magistrates to send him to some place out of this jurisdiction, not to return any more without license from the court."[2]

This and many similar sentences of banishment against heretics, found on the old Massachusetts Records, exhibit the stern and relentless spirit of the Puritans; a spirit worthy of all reprobation, and reproved in the following fine passage of the Protestant divine, Jortin, whom our author quotes, and of whose sentiments we heartily approve:

"To banish, imprison, starve, hang, and burn men for their religion, is not the gospel of Christ, but the gospel of the devil. Where persecution begins, Christianity ends, and if the name of it remains, the spirit is gone. Christ never used anything like force or violence, except once, and that was to drive men *out* of the temple, and not to drive them *in*."[3]

But the Quakers,—the poor, harmless, and inoffensive Quakers,—were those who smarted most under the lash of puritanical intolerance:

"The Quakers were whipped, branded, had their ears cut off, their tongues bored with hot irons, and were banished, upon the pain of death in case of their return, and actually executed upon the gallows."[4]

Yet they had asked for no special privilege; they had merely sought the boon of religious toleration. They could not find this privilege in England; and, like the Puritans themselves, they had emigrated to the new world with the fondly cherished hope that, here at least, they might enjoy freedom of conscience. But sadly were they mistaken. The

---

[1] Record of the court. Blue Laws of Massachusetts, p. 65.

[2] Massachusetts Records. October 1635. Blue Laws &c., p. 67.

[3] Blue Laws, etc., p. 68, note.

[4] Ibid. Preface, p. vi.

Puritans had no bowels of mercy for those who, like themselves, had fled from persecution in the old world. Towards Quakers, especially, they entertained feelings of the most deadly hatred, as the laws common to *all* the New England colonies clearly prove. Among the Blue Laws of Connecticut we find the following:

> "18. No Quaker or *dissenter from the established worship of this dominion*, shall be allowed to give a vote for the election of magistrates or any officers.
>
> "19. *No food or lodging* shall be afforded to a Quaker, Adamite, or other heretic."[1]

But, as we have already intimated, the laws of the Plymouth colony against Quakers were the most rigid of all, and the only ones, in fact, which were strictly executed. The following are among the orders of the Court, assembled at Plymouth at different times in the years 1657, 1658, 1659, &c. They were copied by our author from the Plymouth Records themselves:

> "It is ordered by the court, that in case any shall bring in any Quaker, Rantor, or other notorious heretiques, either by lande or water, into any parte of this government, shall forthwith, upon order from any one magistrate, returne them to the place from whence they came, or clear the government of them on the penaltie of paying the fine of twenty shillings *for every weeke* that they shall stay in the government after warninge."[2]

In the same year it was further

> "Enacted by the court and the authoritie thereof, that noe Quaker or person commonly soe called, *bee entertained by any person or persons* within this government, under the penalty of five pounds for every such default, *or be whipt*, and in case any one shall entertaine any such person ignorantly, if hee shal testify on his oath that hee knew not them to bee such, he shal be freed of the aforesaid penalty, provided hee upon his first discerning them to bee such, doe discover them to the constable or his deputy."[3]

October 6th, 1657, an order was passed banishing Humphrey Norton, a Quaker, from the colony, and on the 14th of October following, this additional law was enacted against Quakers; — for atrocious cruelty it is surpassed by few documents of the kind on record in any country, Christian or pagan:

> "As an addition to the late order in reference to the coming or bringing in of the *cursed sect* of the Quakers into this jurisdiction, it is ordered that whosoever shall from henceforth bring, or cause to be brought, directly or indirectly, any known Quaker or Quakers, or *other blasphemous heretiques* into this jurisdiction, every such person shall forfeit the sum of *one hundred pounds* to the country and shall by warrant from any magistrate, be committed to prison, there to remain till the penalty be satisfied and paid, and if any person or persons within this jurisdiction shall henceforth entertaine and conceal any such Quaker or Quakers, or other blasphemous heretiques (knowing them so to be), every such person shall forfeit to the country *forty shillings for every hour's* enter-

---

[1] Ibid. p. 122.
[2] Ibid. p. 13.
[3] Ibid. p. 14.

tainment and concealment of any Quaker or Quakers as aforesaid, and shall be committed to prison as aforesaid, until the forfeitures be fully satisfied and paid; and it is further ordered, that if any Quaker or Quakers shall presume, after they have once suffered what the law requireth, to come into this jurisdiction, every such male Quaker shall, for the first offence, *have one of his ears cut off*, and be kept att work in the house of correction till he can be sent away att his own charge; and for the second offence, *shall have the other ear cut off*, &c., and kept att the house of correction as aforesaid. And every woman Quaker that hath suffered the law here, that shall presume to come into this jurisdiction, *shall be severely whipt*, and kept at the house of correction at work, till she be sent away *at her own charge*, and so also for her coming again she shall be alike used as aforesaid. And for every Quaker, he or she, that shall a third time herein again offend, THEY SHALL HAVE THEIR TONGUES BORED THROUGH WITH A HOT IRON, and be kept at the house of correction, close at work, till they be sent away *at their own charge*."[1]

Alas for the gallantry and the tender mercies of the pilgrim fathers! If these laws, and many more of a similar nature, too numerous and lengthy for quotation, be any index of their character, then shall we thank God, as long as we live, that we have not a drop of Puritan blood in our veins. We could not even feel easy or comfortable, were we descended from those *holy* men, with long visages and sanctimonious looks, but with cold and iron hearts steeled against humanity; who could pray as long prayers at the corners of the streets as the ancient Pharisees, or the more modern Praise-God-Bare-Bones of Cromwell's fanatical army, but who were as merciless as fanatical, and as hypocritical as any other Pharisees of them all, whether ancient or modern. Much would we prefer to be ranked with the publicans and sinners, than with such *saints!*

By laws subsequently enacted, all persons under suspicion of holding the "diabolical doctrines" of the "cursed sect" of Quakers, were forbidden, under severe penalties, from meeting together for worship;[2] Quakers, Ranters, and all such corrupt persons could not be admitted as freemen, nor be allowed to vote;[3] their books were to be seized by the public officers, and presented to the court;[4] and even their horses were to be taken and confiscated to the government.[5] This last law is so curious, that we must copy it entire:

"Whereas we find that, of late time, the Quakers have bin furnished with horses, and thereby they have not only more speedy passage from place to place to the poisoning of the inhabitants with their *cursed* tenetts, but alsoe thereby have escaped the hands of the officers, that might otherwise have apprehended them. It is therefore enacted by the court and the authoritie thereof, that if any person or persons whatsoever in this government, doth or shall furnish any of them with horse or horse-kind, the same to bee forfited and seized on for the use of this government; or any horses that they shall bring into the government, or shall be brought in for them, and they make use of, shall bee forfited as aforesaid; and that it shall be lawful *for any inhabitant to make seizure of any such horse* and to deliver him to the constable or treasurer for the use of the county."

---

[1] Ibid. p. 14-15. [2] P. 16. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid. p. 20. [5] P. 32.

We will conclude our rapid summary of the laws against Quakers, with the following extract from the Plymouth Record of 1660:

> "It is enacted by the court and the authoritie thereof, that if any person or persons commonly called Quakers, or any other such like *vagabonds* shall come into any towne of this government, the marshall or constable shall apprehend him or them, and upon examination, soe appearing, hee shall *whip them, or cause them to be whipt with rodds,*"[1] &c.

Talk of the Spanish inquisition after this! And yet these laws were not a mere dead letter, as the early history of Massachusetts abundantly proves. It appears, from the public Records themselves, that the following persons were banished, after having suffered imprisonment, and probably the other terrible penalties of the law;— Humphrey Norton, Samuel Shattock, Lawrence Southwick and wife, Nicholas Phelps, Joshua Buffam, and Josiah Southwick; that William Robinson, Marmaduke Stephenson, and Mary Dyer were sentenced to death, and the two first executed; and that the treasurer was empowered to sell into slavery "to any of the English nation at Virginia and Barbadoes, Daniel and Provided Southwick, son and daughter of Lawrence Southwick," because they had been either unwilling or unable to pay the fines imposed on them for recusancy.[2]

The Quakers loudly protested against this high-handed injustice and glaring cruelty; but their protest was either allowed to pass unheeded, or it was met with additional insult. Thus "Humphrey Norton, who was a Quaker, and who had smarted under the rod of persecution of the governor of the Plymouth patent," addressed a letter, "with care and speed," to the chief of his persecutors, upon whom, after having charged him with uttering *eight* palpable *lies*, he thus denounced the divine vengeance:

> "The cry of vengeance will persue thee day and night for other men's goods, hard speeches, unrieghteouse actions which thou hast done and spoken against us and others, without and contrary to the righteouse law; . . . the days of thy wailing will be like unto that of a woman that murthers the fruite of her wombe; the anguish and paine that will enter upon the reignes will be like gnawing wormes lodging betwixt thy hart and liver; when these things come upon thee, and thy back bowed downe with paine, in that daye and houre thou shalt know to thy grief that prophetts to the Lord God wee are, and the God of vengeance is our God."[3]

What reply was made to this and similar protests? The General Court of Massachusetts published an elaborate "declaration," which is found spread out on the Records, and in which the course pursued against the Quakers is defended by a long train of arguments, copiously interlarded with texts of Scripture! The Court thus openly defended the doctrine of persecution on the authority of the Bible. This strongly reminds us of John Calvin's famous, or rather infamous book in favor of punishing heretics, written by him expressly to vindicate his agency in the burning of Servetus. Verily the disciples were worthy of their master; but neither the one nor the other had any right even to pronounce the soul-thrilling word — LIBERTY.

[1] P. 31.   [2] P. 17, seqq.   [3] Pp. 23-4.

But we are tired of unfolding these cruelties; and we willingly pass from the sad history of the formal and demure New England Quakers, to that of the fantastic and mischief-loving New England witches. We know not upon what principle of philosophy or theology we are to account for the singular fact, that witches were at that time so abundant in New England; but the fact itself seems undeniable, at least if we are to give any credit to the testimony of the Rev. Cotton Mather, and of scores of other grave and cotemporary witnesses. Speaking of the great number of cases of witchcraft, which had occurred during his time, the Rev. Cotton Mather says:

> "For every one of which we have such a sufficient evidence, that no reasonable man in this whole country ever did question them; and *it will be unreasonable to do it in any other*."[1]

Another grave old chronicler, John Josselyn, gent., gives the following testimony on the same subject:

> "There are none that beg in this country, but there be witches too many—*bottle-bellied witches* and others—that produce many strange apparitions, if you will believe report, of a shallop at sea manned with women, and of a ship and great red horse standing by the mainmast, the ship being in a small cove to the eastward vanished of a sudden,"[2] &c.

Whoever will reject these authorities, must be very hard to convince, indeed; and had a person so skeptical chanced to live in New England at the time of the famous trials for witchcraft, he would have been in great danger of being hung as a wizard himself,—that's all. We can scarcely even *guess*, why it was that the witches took so remarkable a fancy to the early Yankees. Whether it was that there was some secret congeniality of feeling between the two, or that the evil one envied, and sought to mar, by his diabolical incantations, the extraordinary *sanctity* of the pilgrim fathers, we know not, but leave it to the shrewdness of our readers to divine. Perhaps the following passages from "the wonders of the invisible world," written by the Rev. Cotton Mather, exhibiting the reputed origin, the characteristic symptoms, and the fearful ravages of the New England witchcraft, may aid us greatly in coming to a right conclusion on a subject so important:

> "It is to be confessed and bewailed," says this grave old Puritan minister, "that many inhabitants of New England, and young people especially, had been led away with little sorceries, wherein they did secretly those things that were not right against the Lord their God; they would often cure hurts with spells, and practice detestable conjurations with sieves, and keys, and peas, and nails, and horse shoes, to learn the things for which they had a forbidden and impious curiosity. Wretched books had stolen into the land, wherein fools were instructed how to become able fortune tellers.
>
> "Although these diabolical divinations are more ordinarily committed *perhaps* all over the world, than they are in the country of New England, yet that being a country *devoted unto the worship and service of the Lord Jesus Christ above the rest of the world*, he signalized his vengeance (in)

---

[1] History of New England, b. vi, ch. 7. Quoted by Irving, Works i, 119.

[2] Quoted by Irving, ibid.

these wickednesses with such extraordinary dispensations as have not often (been) seen in other places.

"The devils which had been so played withall, and it may be by some few criminals more explicitly engaged and employed, now broke in upon the country after as astonishing a manner as was ever heard of. Some scores of people, first about Salem, *the centre and first born of all the towns in the colony*, and afterwards in other places, were arrested with many preternatural vexations upon their bodies, and a variety of cruel torments which were evidently from the demons of the invisible world. The people that were infected and infested with such demons, in a few days' time arrived unto such a refining operation upon their eyes, that they could see their tormenters; they saw a devil of a little stature, and of a tawny color, attended still with spectres that appeared in more human circumstances.

"The tormenters tendered to the afflicted a book, requiring them to sign it, or to touch it at least in token of their consenting to be listed in the service of the devil; which they refusing to do, the spectres under the command of that black man, as they called him, would apply themselves to torture them with prodigious molestations.

"The afflicted wretches were horribly distorted and convulsed; they were pinched black and blue; pins would be run every where in their flesh; they would be scalded till they had blisters raised on them; and *a thousand other things*, before *hundreds of witnesses*, were done unto them, evidently preternatural; for if it were preternatural to keep a rigid fast for nine, yea, for fifteen days together; or if it were preternatural to have one's hands tied close together with a rope to be plainly seen, and then by unseen hands presently pulled a great way from the earth, before a crowd of people; such preternatural things were endured by them.

"But of all the preternatural things which these people suffered, there were none more unaccountable than those wherein the prestigious demons would ever now and then cover the most corporeal things in the world with a fascinating mist of invisibility. As now, a person was cruelly assaulted by a spectre, that she said came at her with a spindle, though no body else in the room could see either the spectre or the spindle; at last, in her agonies, giving a snatch at the spectre, she pulled the spindle away; and it was no sooner got into her hand, but the other folks then present beheld that it was indeed a real, proper, iron spindle; which, when they locked up very safe, it was, nevertheless, by the demons taken away to do farther mischief.

"Again, a person was haunted by a most abusive spectre, which came to her, she said, with a sheet about her, though seen to none but herself. After she had undergone a deal of teaze from the annoyance of the spectre, she gave a violent snatch at the sheet that was upon it; whereupon she tore a corner, which in her hand immediately was beheld by all that were present, a palpable corner of a sheet: and her father, which was of her, catched, that he might see what his daughter had so strangely seized; but the spectre had like to have wrung his hand off, by endeavoring to wrest it from him; however, he still held it; and several times this odd accident was renewed in the family. *There wanted not the oaths of good credible people to these particulars.*

"Also is it known, that these wicked spectres did proceed so far as to steal several quantities of money from divers people, part of which individual money dropt sometimes out of the air, before sufficient spectators, into the hands of the afflicted, while the spectres were urging them to subscribe their covenant with death. Moreover, poisons, to the standers-by wholly invisible, were sometimes forced upon the afflicted, which, when they have with much reluctancy swallowed, they have swoln presently, so that the common medicines for poisons have been found necessary to relieve them; yea, sometimes the spectres in the struggles have so dropt the poisons, that the standers-by have smelt them and viewed them, and beheld the pillows of the miserable stained with them. Yet more, the miserable have complained bitterly of burning rags run into their forcibly distended mouths; though no body could see any such clothes, or indeed any fires in their chambers, yet presently the scalds were seen plainly by every body on the mouths of the complainers, and not only the smell, but the smoke of the burning sensibly filled the chambers.

"Once more, the miserable exclaimed of branding irons, heating at the fire on the hearth to mark them; now the standers-by could see no irons, yet they could see *distinctly the prints of them in the ashes, and smell them too*, as they were carried by the not-seen furies unto the poor creatures for whom they were intended; and those poor creatures were thereupon so stigmatized with them, that they will bear the marks of them to their dying day. *Nor are these the tenth part of the prodigies* that fell out among the inhabitants of New England.

"Flashy people," adds the old Puritan divine, "may burlesque these things, but when *hundreds of the most sober people*, in a country where they have as much mother-wit certainly as the rest of mankind, *know them* to be true, nothing but the absurd and froward spirit of Saducism can question them. I have not yet mentioned one thing that will not be justified, if it be necessary, by the oaths of more considerate persons than can ridicule these odd phenomena."[1]

Verily, if all these things be true, we must admit that the demons were particularly intimate with the early Puritans of New England; rather more intimate, in fact, than was at all comfortable for the latter. Shrewd and calculating as were the early Yankees, the imps who played such fantastic tricks among them, were much shrewder. Those devices of the spindle, of the sheet, of the branding-irons, in particular, were truly capital! The invisible spirits knew their trade much better than to try wooden hams or nutmegs, or to attempt the impossible task of overreaching their friends in a bargain. Cunning tricksters were those same witches of New England!

Now, we are Sadducees enough to laugh at all those impostures, and also at the Pharisees who gave them credit and importance. But alas for the poor witches of New England! They were doomed to have other tormentors than the spirits of the invisible world. The Puritan fathers leagued with the demons to torture them to death. What the "devils and the spectres" could not or would not do with their sheets and spindles, and branding-irons, that the early Puritans boldly accomplished with the halter. The extermination of the luckless witches was decreed on earth, as a carrying out of the mischievous plot originally devised in the lower invisible world.

Space fails us to recount all the trials for witchcraft, and all the executions which ensued, chiefly at and about Salem, in the year 1692.

[1] Blue Laws, &c., p. 299, seq.

They are given in great detail by our author of the Blue Laws, and also by Bancroft in the third volume of his "History of the United States." We will content ourselves with a few extracts from this latter highly respectable historian:

> "At the trial of George Burroughs, a minister, the bewitched persons pretended to be dumb. 'Who hinders those witnesses,' says Stoughton (the deputy governor), 'from testifying?' 'I suppose the devil,'— answered Burroughs. 'How comes the devil,' retorted the chief judge, 'so loath to have any testimony borne against *you?*' And the question was effective. Besides he had given proofs of great, if not preternatural muscular strength. Cotton Mather calls the evidence 'enough;' the jury gave a verdict of *guilty*." [1]

At the execution of Burroughs, Cotton Mather made one of the most heartless, and almost fiendish speeches we have ever chanced to read: he seemed even to exult over the imminent damnation of the convicted wizzard! [2] And another preacher, named Noyes, on seeing eight persons hung up together as witches, had the heartlessness to exclaim: "THERE HANG EIGHT FIREBRANDS OF HELL!!" Alas for the tender mercies of the pilgrim fathers!

Well, the delusion at length subsided; but not until a great number of crazy, "afflicted," or innocent persons, had been sacrificed to the insatiable Moloch of religious fanaticism, or rather to the senseless idol of a stupid superstition. The Rev. Cotton Mather thus cooly winds up his narrative of the New England witchcraft:

> "Now upon a deliberate review of these things, his excellency (Sir William Phips) first reprieved, and then pardoned many of them that had been condemned; and there fell out several strange things that caused the spirit of the country to run as vehemently on the acquitting of all the accused, as it by mistake ran at first upon the condemning of them. In fine, the last courts that sate upon this thorny business, finding that it was impossible to penetrate into the whole meaning of the things that had happened, and that so many unsearchable cheats were interwoven into the conclusion of a mysterious business, which perhaps had not crept thereinto at the beginning of it, they cleared the accused as fast as they tried them; *and within a little while the afflicted were most of them delivered out of their troubles also;* and the land had peace restored unto it, *by the God of peace treading Satan under foot.*" [3]

That is, the good Puritans first hung the witches, and then found out that they were *perhaps* innocent! Shrewd jurists they, and enlightened, merciful Christians! We leave other comments on this "thorny business" to our readers; merely remarking that it ill becomes the children of the Puritans to taunt Catholics with superstition, fanaticism, intolerance, or cruelty.

We conclude this paper with the following humorous passage from Washington Irving's "History of New York:"

> "The witches were all burnt, banished, or panic-struck, and in a little while there was not an ugly old woman to be found throughout New England,— which is doubtless one reason why all the young women

---

[1] Vol iii, p. 84.

[2] See ibid. p 93.

[3] Blue Laws, &c., p. 306.

there are so handsome. Those honest folk who had suffered from their incantations gradually recovered, excepting such as had been afflicted with twitches and aches, which, however, assumed the less alarming aspects of rheumatism, sciatics, and lumbagoes,—and the good people of New England, abandoning the study of the occult sciences, turned their attention to the more profitable hocus-pocus of trade, and soon became expert in the legerdemain art of turning a penny. Still, however, a tinge of the old leaven is discernible, even unto this day, in their characters,—witches occasionally start up among them in different disguises, as physicians, civilians, and *divines*. The people at large show a keenness, a cleverness, and a profundity of wisdom that savor strongly of witchcraft,—and it has been remarked, that whenever any stones fall from the moon, the greater part of them is sure to tumble into New England."[1]

---

[1] Irving's works, vol. i, p. 120.

PART II.

THEOLOGICAL.

Reviews, Essays, and Lectures.

PART II.–THEOLOGICAL.

XXI. THE SPIRIT OF THE AGE.

TEMPORAL AND ETERNAL.

What doth it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?—
St. Matthew xvi, 26.

Is this an enlightened age?—Enlightenment and empiricism—Material progress—Constant agitation and fever—Rest and motion—Self-complacency—Two classes of extravagance pointed out—And illustrated—Doctrine of progress applied to religion—Degrading religion to an earthly standard—Reason and faith—Incident related by St. Augustine—Reasoning backwards—A tower of Babel—Modern systems of philosophy—True and false liberty—Evils growing out of sectarianism—Carrying out a false principle—Private judgment—The great struggle and final issue—Protestantism and enlightenment—American infidelity—Parallel lines of reasoning adopted by the sects and by infidels—Fanaticism and infidelity—Mammonism—Money and virtue—Mammon worship in churches—Utilitarianism—Wrong views of education—Religious indifference and latitudinarianism—Frightful moral disorders—Fruits of Protestantism—The great problem of the age.

Some malicious wight has ventured to call this age the *sæculum humbuggianum;* but we greatly prefer to call it the age of enlightenment. This latter epithet, besides being vastly more polite and fashionable, is, at the same time, perhaps more nearly connected with the truth. True, we have empiricism in every thing; in medicine, in science, in politics, and even in religion! The empiric deals not only in quack medicines and in political *legerdemain*, but also in the once hallowed tenets of a holy religion! Our modern mountebanks feast us on Millerism and Mormonism, as well as on Fourierism and Mesmerism, to say nothing of a thousand and one other new-fangled notions and *isms*. When the wisest of men said, "There is nothing new under the sun," he could scarcely have directed his prophetic vision to our enlightened age. We have certainly hit upon some new things, which would have greatly astonished and startled even Solomon himself.

Still our confidence in this being an enlightened period is not at all shaken. The extravagances, to which we have just alluded, are but exceptions to the general spirit of our age. Enlightenment is the rule, empiricism the exception. The latter is a superabundant growth on a rich and fertile soil. The noxious weeds with their wild luxuriance may cumber the ground uselessly, but they cannot wholly choke the many healthy and useful plants which flourish thereon. And it may be, that by a judicious system of cultivation, we may finally succeed in plucking out the evil weeds altogether, and in causing the goodly plants to shoot forth their branches, and to yield their abundant fruits, for the healing of the nations, without let or hindrance.

Yes, we are free to avow the belief that ours *is*, in some respects, an enlightened age. In certain points of view, the present is far in advance of any preceding age. As far as mere earthly interests and comforts are concerned, we can boast of great improvements over our more simple and unsophisticated ancestors. All the useful arts have attained a perfection never dreamed of by them, even in their wildest reveries. In navigation, in commerce, and in ship-building; in warlike accoutrements and in naval equipments; in the facilities of intercourse both by sea and by land; and in the appliances of domestic comfort; we are immeasurably ahead of our forefathers in all past ages. We travel a thousand miles now in a shorter time, and with more comfort, than our ancestors did a hundred; we traverse the ocean with as much facility as they did an arm of the sea, or an inland lake. By the invention of steam-navigation and the great improvements recently made therein, we have almost succeeded in annihilating time and space. We have brought the whole world into close and intimate correspondence. The old and new worlds, once separated by an almost impassable gulf, are now brought almost into contact. The most ordinary articles of our daily consumption, such as spice, pepper, and tea, are brought from the very antipodes, and, in return, we spread out before the antipodes our own products. Thus the very extremities of the globe are made near to each other; and the children of the earth, inhabiting the remotest boundaries thereof, are brought together, and associate as brethren of the same great family.

Still we are not satisfied. We are always in a restless fever of agitation and excitement. We are never at rest, but when we are in motion. We forget what is past, and we bend forward to what is future. Past discoveries, great and magnificent as they are, are all counted as nothing; we anticipate something much more brilliant in the future. The surface of society is like that of the ocean lashed into foamy billows by the winds of heaven. But, unlike the sea, we are never at rest. The great characteristic of the age is PROGRESS. We must progress in every thing; in the arts, in the sciences, in legislation, in philosophy, and even in religion! We are always looking restlessly *ahead*. Inventions, which once dazzled the world with their brilliancy and promise of usefulness, have been long since superseded and forgotton. The cumbrous and imperfect steamboat machinery of Blasco de Garay and of Biancas were superseded by the more simple and manageable apparatus of Fulton; while this too, in its turn, has given way to the more available methods suggested by recent discoveries.

Little did even Fulton dream of the wonderful extent to which his discovery, or rather improvement, would be rendered available for the purposes of manufacture, of land travel, of navigation, and of naval warfare. Little did the Italian physician Galvani think, while experimenting on frogs with his metallic plates, that he was laying the foundations of a science which, at no distant period, would be applied to the instantaneous transmission of intelligence between the most remote points, and, perhaps, to the purposes of machinery and navigation. Still less, we are quite sure, did the simple-minded Italian suspect that the notable *science* of animal magnetism would be built up on this discovery! Little did the first inventors of the noble art of printing imagine the amazing progress which their simple invention would soon make in the world, and the wonders to be achieved by the steam and the power-press. And little did any among the earlier harbingers of science dream of the beautiful discovery of Daguerre, by which the rays of the sun are caught in their rapid progress towards the earth, and are made to subserve the purposes of the pictorial art, without the aid of either the brush, the pencil, or the coloring material of the painter!

All these, and many others, are the triumphs of modern art and science. And yet, as we have already said, we are not content with our present improvements. We rush forward in the career of discovery with the speed of one of our own steamboats or locomotives; and we make almost as much noise, and give out almost as much smoke, in our progress. Puff! puff!! puff!!! is our watch-word, and the token of our progress. This is the age of *puffing*, no less than of progress. With us every thing goes by steam. The steam engine is the characteristic and the most appropriate emblem of our age. We have made amazing progress in every thing; we know it and *feel* it; and we wish others to know it and to feel it as well. And if others should not know it and feel it, it will surely be for no want of boasting on our parts. Our Fourth-of-July orators and itinerant lecturers; our pulpit orators and our rostrum haranguers; our journalists and our reviewers, have heralded forth this fact so often and so loudly, that surely the world must be very deaf and stupid indeed not to have found out by this time, that we *are* a great and enlightened people, and that ours is peculiarly the age of enlightenment. Never, since the world began, has the saying of the inspired apostle been more fully or more strikingly verified: "SCIENTIA INFLAT—knowledge puffeth up." At no former period was the accompanying warning of the apostle more appropriate or more needed: "If any man thinketh that he knoweth any thing, he hath not yet known as he ought to know."[1] Our knowledge is great, but our self-glorification is greater. Our science is inflated and vain-glorious in the extreme. We have not yet learned the noble modesty of Socrates, who, after having devoted a long life and a vigorous intellect to moral and scientific pursuits, said when near the close of his career: "*Hoc unum scio, me scire nihil*—this one thing do I know, that I know nothing."

Now, we do not at all object to this spirit of progress, so characteristic of our age; we applaud it rather, if it be kept within its appropriate limits. We merely rebuke its extravagances and its excesses. These are mainly reducible to two classes: first, an application of the doctrine of progress to religion and to heavenly things; and secondly an almost total forgetfulness of religion and of heaven, in the all-absorbing interest which the mind is made to take in things of this earth. We will devote this paper to a brief consideration of these two leading errors of modern society; and if our humble efforts should contribute even ever so little to the awakening of public attention to a subject of vast and paramount importance, and if they should even slightly contribute to the more healthy development of the great principle of progress, we shall not have labored wholly in vain. We will endeavor, then, to show that modern society is grievously wrong in both of two ways:

---

[1] 1 Corinth. viii, 1. 2.

28

1. In its application of the doctrine of progress to religion and to heavenly things.

2. In its almost total forgetfulness of religion and of heavenly things, in the all-absorbing interest which it takes in the comparatively paltry concerns of this earth.

1. That there is in our age a strong tendency to bring down the noble and sublime truths of religion to the low level of mere earthly knowledge, we think no impartial and philosophic observer of the signs of our times will or can deny. That this tendency is entirely wrong; that it is founded on very imperfect or erroneous notions of religion; and that it debases and degrades this heavenly science, we think equally undeniable. That it is fraught with danger, and that it has already produced the most lamentable results, a mere glance at the leading features of modern society will be sufficient to prove. We can not in any other way explain the extensive prevalence of unbelief among us; nor can we otherwise account for the mischievous theories which have been broached and received with favor, if not with avidity, by large masses of our population. There is surely something grievously wrong *some where;* and we will endeavor briefly to point out the wrong and its remedy.

The wrong lies precisely where we have located it:—in the vain attempt to estimate heavenly things by a merely earthly standard; the remedy consists in a counter movement, embracing a return to sounder principles of reasoning. Religion is something apart from, and immeasurably above, mere human speculation and knowledge; it treats of God, of heavenly things, of eternity. It is the embodiment of divine wisdom; of principles and truths unfolding the nature and attributes of God himself, and His revelations in time to His creatures. To know and to estimate aright the things of God, we must have God himself for our teacher, or at least some one authorized and commissioned by Him to teach us in His name, and with His unerring truth. Any other teacher would be wholly incompetent to the task; because any other might be mistaken and might mislead us fatally. The truths of religion rest not on mere human speculation, or theory, or science; they rest on a *fact;*—that God himself has so declared and so spoken in His revelation to man. The Lord hath spoken; let the earth be silent, and let men listen with reverent awe:—such is the principle upon which alone we can learn religion aright and with certainty. To attempt to learn it in any other manner, would betray a woful ignorance of the first elements of religion, and would mislead us in a thousand ways.

To pretend that we can find out what religion is by mere unaided human reason, is about as wise as would be the declaration of the mountebank, that he could light up the heavens of a dark night with a mere rush-light! Such a pretension forcibly reminds us of the beautiful allegorical incident related by St. Augustine. This greatest man of his age tells us that, when he was once walking on the sea shore, he observed a man very busily engaged in dipping up the water of the sea, and pouring it into a small basin which he had excavated in the sand of the beach. To the holy Doctor's inquiry as to the object which prompted this singular conduct, the simple peasant replied, that he meant to dry up the sea by emptying its waters into the cavity! St. Augustine smiled at his simplicity, but turned the incident to account in his writings against the Manicheans and other unbelievers of his day.

Our modern philosophers are attempting to do precisely what that foolish peasant fancied he could accomplish;—they would fain make the immense, boundless, and unfathomable ocean of God's truth pass through the narrow and shallow basin of their own reason! They apply the principles of human science to religion, with as much confidence as they apply algebra to geometry. With them, religion is to be estimated only by human knowledge. The inflated doctrine of human progress is the starting point; religion is the conclusion reached. Science is everything; religion is almost nothing: at least, science is the principal thing; religion is but a secondary consideration—an adjunct, a corollary.

In religion those things are readily admitted, which human science can understand or demonstrate; those are rejected which human science is pleased to reject. Whatsoever doctrines of revelation appear to them to promote human knowledge and to aid human progress, are received with applause and hailed with delight; whatever wars against human pride, is painful to human sensuality, or is humbling to human reason, is rejected with scorn. Mysteries can not be fathomed or understood; therefore mysteries must be rejected. It matters not, that there are thousands of mysteries in this lower world, both around and within us,—mysteries which all agree in admitting, without being able to understand or explain them; it matters not how strong may be the evidence which establishes the *fact*, that God, who can neither deceive nor be deceived, *has revealed* those same mysteries; they will not believe them, because they cannot understand them! Thus, certain astronomers could not prove the existence of God mathematically; *therefore*, they sagely concluded the existence of God is at best but problematical! Thus, also, certain learned *Christian* philosophers can not, for the life of them, understand the nature or utility of the great revealed doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Real Presence, &c.; *therefore*, all these must go by the board! These wise men might as well blot out the myriads of twinkling stars from the firmament, under the pretence that they cannot understand the utility of so many bodies in our system! And they might exclaim with their prototype Judas Iscariot: "*Ut quid perditio hæc,*"—why this sad waste of light?

There is something radically wrong in all this line of reasoning. Those who adopt it begin at the wrong end of the argument, and reason backwards. Instead of reasoning from high to low—from heaven to earth, they reason from low to high—from earth to heaven. Instead of raising up the earth to the lofty standard of heaven, they would fain bring down heaven to the low standard of earth. Puffed up with the pride of learning and with the windy spirit of the age, they would, like Lucifer of old, raise themselves up to the very heavens of God, and either seek to place themselves on a level with the Eternal himself, or to bring down the Eternal to their own abject position. With Lucifer they say, in the pride of their hearts: "I will ascend into heaven, and I will exalt my throne above the stars of God. . . . . I will ascend above the clouds; I will be like the Most High."[1] Would that they did remember Lucifer's fall; and they might learn to beware! Would that they did but place a lower and more truthful estimate on themselves, and a higher estimate on God and on heavenly things! Weak, erring, and short-sighted as they are, would that they could but learn a little more modesty in inquiring into things infinitely above themselves, and entirely beyond the range of their imperfect vision! In a word, would that the emphatic language of the great apostle of the gentiles were not fully verified in them: "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools!"[2]

But alas! Such a hope were almost idle in our vain-glorious age! The great ones of the earth never learn anything. The experience of the past, the striking lights of history with its fearful lessons, the teachings of a sounder philosophy, are all thrown away on them. In spite of all that can be alleged, they persist in being "vain in their thoughts,—*evanuerunt in cogitationibus suis.*"[3] Like the builders in the plains of Shinar, they have foolishly sought to erect a tower which shall reach to the very heavens; but like them too, their speech has been confounded. The inflated philosophy of the day is a modern Babel;—a sad jumble of contradictory theories and speculations. As in the days of Cicero, there is no absurdity whatever, which the *soi-disant* philosophers of the age have not broached and idolized. Atheists, deists, materialists, pantheists, rationalists, eclectics, transcendentalists, perfectionists, Fourierists, Millerites, Mormons, socialists, mesmerists, neurologists, &c., &c., &c.,—what a conglomeration of jarring elements, or rather absurdities! And, as if we had not already absurdities enough, new ones are daily starting into existence; and it is a sad thing that nothing new can be broached, no matter how shocking or absurd, which does not gain proselytes! Alas for our *enlightened* age!

Perhaps the most fashionable absurdities of the day are pantheism, eclecticism, and transcendentalism. These three systems — if systems they may be called — are but a revival, under new and more witching forms, of very old systems of *pagan* philosophy, long since consigned to the tomb of the Capulets. Pantheism is but a new form of the ancient Platonism; — a system peculiarly acceptable to our modern philosophers, because it deified the world, made matter an object of idolatry, worshiped the creature, and forgot the Creator. The modern, like the ancient eclectic in the days of Cicero, prided himself in the assumption, that he has succeeded in extracting the quintessence of all that is best in all other systems of philosophy, and in harmonizing together the truths thus extracted; whereas, the truth is, that he has only succeeded in showing his own inconsistency and absurdity, in the attempt to harmonize contradictions. The transcendentalist steps gallantly forth to the rescue of the pantheist and of the eclectic, when these are pressed by the stringent logic of the Christian philosopher; and he dexterously conceals the true position, or covers the retreat of his allies, with a cloud of grandiloquent, but unmeaning verbiage. His motto is that of Horace's poetaster: "*ex igne dare fumum*" — to smother the brightly burning fire of truth with a heavy superincumbent mass of smoke! You know not where to have him; for his panoply is — smoke. His real position was very appropriately defined by the Scotch highlander, who, when asked the definition of metaphysics, replied: "When a man dinna know what another man says, and the other man dinna know what himself says, that's metaphysics!"

---

[1] Isaiah xiv, 13, 14.

[2] Rom. i, 22.

[3] Ibid. v, 21.

It is a sad and a sober fact, that the intellectual and philosophic atmosphere of our age has become hazy and foggy to such an extent, that the bright sun of truth is almost wholly concealed from the eyes of the simple-minded beholder. Those who are content to become little children for Christ's sake, really know more of sound philosophy, though they boast less, than the proudest philosophers of them all.

These men tell us, as an apology for their never-ending and ever-changing theories, that this is an age of enlightenment and of progress. Nonsense. Is the heaping of absurdity on absurdity, and the adding of vagary to vagary, any evidence of enlightenment or of progress? They tell us that this is the age of mental liberty and of free inquiry in every thing, — from things in the humblest walks of life up to those in the highest regions of philosophy and religion. Nonsense. Is there, then, no difference between rational liberty, trammeled only by the fetters of sober reason and by the golden bonds of obedience to a divinely constituted and clearly ascertained divine religion, and that licentiousness of intellect which knows and acknowledges no restraint whatever, human or divine? Must we become sons of Belial, and shake off all restraints of every kind, in order to be *free?* If liberty can be attained only on such conditions, and at such cost, then away with liberty; we have had too much of it already. We pant for no higher freedom than that of which Jesus spoke, when he said: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."[1] We want no higher freedom than this. Dearly as we prize liberty, we value no other than that of which the venerable prince of the apostles speaks, when he warns us to conduct ourselves, "As free, and not as making liberty a cloak for malice, but as the servants of God."[1]

---

[1] St. John viii, 32.

What benefits or truths have the proudly boasting philosophers, who have the hallowed name of liberty forever on their lips, really bequeathed to the world, after all the noise they have made on the subject? We have already seen what bequest they have left us; and until they have something better to offer, we are done with them. We are content to be little children; aye, to "become fools for Christ's sake." Pride precipitated Lucifer from heaven, and pride drove our first parents from the earthly paradise; pride is the main spring of modern philosophy, and the bane of modern society; pride has heaped nothing but maledictions, mental and moral, on our race: we are done with pride, and we embrace with delight the less attractive but more safe way of humility, being most fully persuaded, that "God rejects the proud, and gives His grace to the humble."

Disguise the fact as we may, it is still a *fact*, that the wrong which we deplore is not confined to those who, in our day, wear the mantle of philosophy; it has extended to the sects, and it has done its deadly work among them. Sectarianism has been always cursed and blighted by the same evils which have ruined philosophy; and these evils have sprung from the same polluted fountain of private judgment and individual reason, proudly raising itself up against the teachings of authority. The sectarian prates as much about liberty and the emancipation of the human mind, as does the infidel philosopher. Voltaire and Rousseau did but seize up and re-echo through the world the self-same shout of LIBERTY, which Luther and Calvin had sent forth, two and a half centuries before in Germany and Switzerland. The infidels did but carry out the leading doctrine of the reformers, and all the world saw and *felt* the awful results of that principle, when it was fully developed.

And not only the French infidels, but the children of the reformers themselves, have carried out that mischievous doctrine to its logical and most fearful consequences. What is it that has blighted German, and Swiss, and European Protestantism generally? What is it that has filled the land of Luther and of Calvin,— which erewhile resounded with the battle cry of freedom from the tyranny of the papacy — with the discordant notes of triumph, now raised by the rationalists, pantheists, and transcendentalists? What is it, that has there made the press, and the pulpit, and the professor's chair the vehicles of downright infidelity? What is it but this same demoniacal shout of LIBERTY — liberty as excluding, and in deadly opposition to, *all* restraint of authority? Private reason first undertook to judge for itself in matters of religion, and it has ended in rejecting religion altogether! Infidelity has triumphed over Protestantism on the very soil and the very first battle-ground of Protestantism; and it has achieved its triumph, too, with the very weapons which Protestantism placed in its hands! Is not this true? Is it not lamentably true?

---

[1] 1 Peter ii, 16.

We must be blind to the spirit and manifest tendency of our age, not to perceive that the great struggle in our own republic will, at no distant day, be not so much between Catholicity and Protestantism, as between Catholicity and infidelity. Protestantism in this country will, and must in the very nature of things, run the same career, and pass through the same phases, that it has run and passed through in Europe, and it must ultimately share the same fate. Torn and distracted within, split up into a hundred warring sects already, and yearly witnessing new divisions, and the rise of new sects, it must, sooner or later, fall a prey to its own dissensions, and become a victim of those warring elements of dissolution which are already festering in its very bosom. Jesus hath uttered the prophecy, and the prophecy must be fulfilled: "*Every* kingdom divided against itself shall be made desolate, and *every* city or house divided against itself shall not stand."[1] American must bide the doom of German Protestantism; nothing can prevent this result. The sects may make a prodigious noise; they may put on a sanctimonious air; they may boast their love of the Bible; they may prate about the sabbath; they may league together against Catholicity; they may make desperate and almost supernatural efforts to infuse a sort of spasmodic and galvanic life into their else lifeless followers; but their doom is sealed, and no human power can avert it.

PROTESTANTISM CANNOT BEAR THE TOUCH OF LITERATURE AND ENLIGHTENMENT. Paradoxical as this may appear, it is even true. Reason and history both proclaim its truth. The endless vagaries and the countless inconsistencies of Protestantism must vanish before the progress of enlightenment, even as the mists vanish before the rising sun of day. One of the most eloquent writers of the day has said: "Science is an acid which corrodes and consumes every thing but the pure gold of truth;" and never was a truer thing said. Such has been precisely the result of progressive enlightenment in Germany, and such it will be in this country, so certainly as similar causes invariably produce similar effects under similar circumstances.

In fact, a mere glance at the religious aspect of our country is sufficient to convince us that "the mystery of iniquity already worketh"[2] among us. Look at Boston, said to be the most enlightened city of our union. What is it but the paradise of infidels, and of sects bordering on the very verge of infidelity? What is it but the great centre of Universalism, of Unitarianism, of Fourierism, of Parkerism, of Transcendentalism, and, perhaps, of many other *isms* of a similar character? How sadly have the children of the Puritans degenerated from the rigid orthodoxy of their sires, who whilom enacted the blue laws, hung the witches, bored the tongues of the Quakers with red hot iron, and drove forth brother

[1] St. Matthew xii, 25.

[2] 2 Thessalon. ii, 7.

Protestants into the frowning wilderness! Is not Puritanism, in its very stronghold, fast verging to downright infidelity?

Look at New York, our great commercial emporium. Each succeeding year the infidels hold there a national convention, for the purpose of organizing themselves for a regular crusade against Christianity. The convention conducts its proceedings unblushingly, in the open light of day; it is held, as if in defiance, during the very week of the great *religious* anniversaries; and even women participate in its deliberations! The public press, too, spread out before the community the speeches and resolutions of this assembly, with a nonchalance really ominous. What, but a few years ago, would have sent a thrill of horror from one end of this union to the other, now causes comparatively but a slight sensation, and passes off almost without a rebuke!

If all these, and many similar signs of the times, fail to convince us of the strong infidel tendency of our age, the startling fact revealed by the religious statistics of the American Almanac can not fail to rivet that conviction on the minds of the most skeptical. It is estimated, from authentic sources of information, that, of all our adult population, over twenty-one years of age, MORE THAN HALF BELONG TO NO RELIGIOUS DENOMINATION WHATEVER! That is, that more than half of our grown population is composed either of downright unbelievers, or of persons indifferent on the subject of religion, or, at least, of those who have not yet made up their minds as to the sect they mean to embrace. And yet this is the age of boasted enlightenment, and this is the land of open Bibles, of tract and missionary societies, and of religious knowledge!

In view of all these facts, we must believe that there is something grievously and radically wrong in the whole religious complexion and tendency of our age. Effects so startling must have an adequate cause, and it requires no wizard to tell what that cause is. The fatal source of all this mischief is THE PRINCIPLE OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT IN MATTERS OF RELIGION, IN OPPOSITION TO THAT OF AUTHORITY. The distracting and disorganizing principle of individuality has set itself up against the great conservative principle of an authority, based on antiquity, and secured from error by Divine promise. Hence the prolific brood of jarring sects which overspread our land; hence the unsettling of religious belief; hence indifferentism and infidelity.

The truth is, the leading Protestant sects employ against the distinctive doctrines of Catholicity the self-same arguments that the infidel employs against Christianity. The doctrine of the real presence is unreasonable and absurd, therefore it must be rejected. The doctrine of confession is too humiliating to man, and gives too much power and influence to the priesthood; therefore it, too, must be discarded. The hierarchy and the papal supremacy fetter individual freedom of opinion, therefore they must be abolished. Catholicity imposes too many painful restraints on human nature; it is antiquated, and no longer adapted to the growing wants and exigencies of our *enlightened* age; therefore Catholicity must be put down. What other species of logic than this does the infidel employ against Christianity itself? What other weapons are wielded against the Bible, with its astonishing miracles and incomprehensible mysteries?

So long as Protestantism will continue to adopt a system of logic flattering human pride, and pandering to human passion, so long will it lend weapons to infidelity to be wielded with murderous effect against Christianity itself. In its present distracted condition, and with its present worldly armor, it must prove utterly powerless in the warfare with unbelief. It occupies a false position; it began wrong, and has continued wrong; it must retrace its steps, and re-occupy the old Catholic vantage ground, ere it can hope to battle successfully in the sacred cause of truth. The experience of full three hundred years has already proved the ruinous tendency of the principle which was its great starting point; till that principle be discarded, infidelity will and must continue to reap an abundant harvest, wherever Protestantism is prevalent. It has ever been so; it will ever be so; in the very nature of things it must be so.

The religious opinions of our age and country oscillate between two extremes, fanaticism and indifferentism. On the one hand we behold an extreme of religious excitement, on the other, an almost total apathy or a lurking sneer. On the one side, we hear an endless cant about the sabbath and the Bible, about revivals and "getting religion," about tract societies and missionary societies, about money to support the missionaries, and their wives and children; on the other, we are chilled by an ominous silence, as of the grave. Fanaticism makes the most noise; but indifferentism gains the most proselytes. We seem to be on the eve of beholding the full verification of that awful prophecy uttered by Christ: "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find, think you, faith on the earth?"[1]

We repeat, then, the declaration of our firm conviction, that the great coming struggle in our age and country will not be between Catholicity and Protestantism, so much as between Catholicity and indifferentism or infidelity. The present desperate effort of Protestantism to put down Catholicity in this *free* republic is evidently spasmodic, and can not last long; it is a fierce and animated skirmishing, which is but the forerunner of the great coming struggle between Catholicity and unbelief. But Catholicity has already come out victorious from too many fierce contests with infidelity, in every possible form and shape, to fear the issue of this great struggle. Her brow is already decorated with too many laurel wreaths of victory, to allow her to anticipate or fear defeat in her old age. He that could not err has said: "The gates of hell SHALL NOT prevail against her."[2]

II. The second position which we proposed to establish, viz., that modern society forgets religion and heavenly things in the all-absorbing interest which it takes in the paltry concerns of this earth, need not detain us long. This general worldly-mindedness of our age is but too

[1] St. Luke, xviii, 8.

apparent, and it is one other fruitful source of that religious indifference which we have just been deploring. With the men of our age this world is everything, the world to come is nothing. They think on time and its short-lived and ever-changing interests; they forget eternity with its never-ending rewards and punishments. Or if they think of eternity at all, it is only at long intervals, and with but little attention. The world, with its bustling scenes and busy pursuits, engrosses everything.

Avarice is the besetting sin of the age. Ours is, emphatically, the enlightened age of *dollars and cents!* Its motto is; POST NUMMOS VIRTUS;—MONEY FIRST, VIRTUE AFTERWARDS! Utilitarianism is the order of the day. Everything is estimated in dollars and cents. Almost every order and profession—our literature, our arts, and our sciences—all worship in the temple of mammon. The temple of God is open during only *one* day in the week, that of mammon is open during *six*. Everything smacks of gold. The fever of avarice is consuming the very heart's blood of our people. Hence that restless desire to grow suddenly rich; hence that feverish agitation of our population; hence broken constitutions and premature old age. If we have not discovered the philosopher's stone, it has surely not been for want of the seeking. If everything cannot now be turned into gold, it is certainly not for want of unceasing exertions for this purpose.

We have even heard of churches having been built on speculation! And if the traveler from some distant clime should chance suddenly to enter one of our *fashionable* meeting-houses; if he should look at its splendidly cushioned seats, on which people are seen comfortably lolling, and then glance at the naked walls, and the utter barrenness of all religious emblems and associations in the interior of the building, he would almost conclude that he had entered, by mistake, into some finely furnished lecture-room, where the ordinary topics of the day were to be discussed. And if he were informed that this edifice had been erected and furnished by a joint stock company on shares, and that these shrewd speculators looked confidently to the income from the rent of the seats as a return for their investment, his original impression would certainly not be weakened. But the conclusion would be irresistible, if he were told still farther, that, in order to secure a good attendance of the rich and fashionable, the owners of the stock had taken the prudent precaution to engage, at a high salary, some popular and eminent preacher! Those who have watched closely the signs of the times, will admit that this is not a mere fancy sketch, and that it is not even exaggerated.

Alas! alas! for the utilitarianism, or rather materialism of our boasted age of enlightenment! In such a condition of things, can we wonder at the general prevalence of religious indifference, and of unblushing infidelity? As in the days of Horace, our children are taught to calculate, but not to pray. They learn arithmetic, but not religion.

The mischievous maxim, that children must grow up without any distinctive religious impressions, and then, when they have attained the age of discretion, must choose a religion for themselves, is frightfully prevalent amongst us. This maxim is about as wise as would be that of the agriculturist who should resolve to permit his fields to lie neglected in the spring season, and to become overgrown with weeds and briers, under the pretext that, when summer would come, it would be time enough to scatter over them the good seed! It amounts to this: human nature is corrupt and downward in its tendency; let it fester in its corruption, and become confirmed in its rottenness; and then it will be time enough to apply the remedy, or, rather, human nature will then re-act and heal itself!

Another cognate maxim, equally prevalent, is equally mischievous in its tendency. It is the latitudinarian doctrine, that it matters not what religion a man embraces, provided he endeavor to be a moral man and an upright citizen. As if light and darkness, truth and error, were indifferent to God! As if Christ would have died on the cross to seal His holy religion with His blood, and yet is wholly indifferent whether men embrace it or not! As if the divine Author of Christianity had left His religion vague and undefined, to be apprehended by each one according to his own judgment and fancy, or had made it a jumble of confused and jarring sects!

With all these pernicious maxims current in our community, and silently exercising their malign influence on successive generations, can we wonder at the dreadful and constantly increasing moral disorders which prevail? Can we wonder that our youth, under such training, drink in vice like water, and become the bane of that society of which they should be the ornament and support? Raised without any intellectual or religious restraint, and with but little moral discipline, is it at all surprising that intemperance, quarrels, riots, and bloodshed, are the order of the day? Human nature is corrupt, and, when unrestrained by religion, it naturally runs into excesses of every kind. Unless children are trained up to govern their passions, how will they learn to restrain them when arrived at the age of manhood? Scarcely a day passes, that we do not read of some dreadful deed of violence, homicide, or murder; and unless the evil be checked, our newspapers will become little better than Newgate Calendars! Alas, for the moral evils of our times!

Such, O Protestantism, are some of the bitter fruits thou hast bequeathed to the world! Such are some of the "fantastic tricks" thou hast played off before high heaven! Thou art fairly responsible for the unsettling of religious faith, for the frightful multiplication of sects, for the wide-spread moral disorders, and for the extensive prevalence of religious indifference and infidelity in our land! And on the great day of the Lord, when the secrets of men shall be revealed by the Searcher of hearts, thou shalt be held strictly to thy responsibility!

With all these mischievous maxims extensively prevalent, and with the canker of sectarianism preying on its very heart-strings, Protestantism can do little more than secure a mere external conformity and a lifeless formalism, if it can even do that. It may succeed in preserving a fair exterior; it may "make clean the *outside* of the cup and of the dish," but decay is at its bosom, and it is powerless for *internal* purification. It has been weighed in the balance, and has been found wanting. It has strained at the gnat of alleged abuses in the Catholic Church, and it has swallowed the camel of sectarianism. It has wasted its energies on trifles, and has "let alone the weightier things of the law: judgment, and mercy, and *faith*."[1] It must return to "its first faith;" it must seek "the rock from which it was riven;" it must "stand by the way, and look, and ask for the OLD PATHS, which is the good way, and walk in it;"[2] else it can find no rest to its soul, and can effect no healing of the nations by its ministrations!

In conclusion, we repeat the opinion, that the great problem of our age will be, to decide between Catholicity and infidelity, and that the sooner this issue is clearly understood and fairly met, the better. Nothing but Catholicity can heal the disorders of the age, and give a wholesome impulse and direction to its tendencies. Protestantism has been tried, and it has failed; it has aggravated, instead of healing, the crying evils of the times.

[1] St. Matth. xxiii, 23, 25.

[2] Jeremiah vi, 16.

XXII. THE CHARGE OF IDOLATRY—HONOR AND INVOCATION OF SAINTS.*

The curve and the straight line—The issue of the Puseyite movement—Its benefits—Origin of the controversy concerning Idolatry in the Catholic Church—Palmer and Dr. Wiseman—Charge by the former—How met by the latter—Palmer's criterion applied against himself—His line of reasoning unfair—Three propositions laid down—And proved—Catholic doctrine stated—Testimony by the Council of Trent—The Missal and the Breviary—Why are the Saints honored and invoked?—Passage from the late Pope's encyclical letter explained—Guardian angels—Objected passages explain themselves—Prayer of Cardinal Bona—Incident in the life of St. Alphonsus Liguori—St. Francis di Girolamo—The Pope's encyclical again—Palmer's Italics—The climax of idolatry—Coldness and enthusiasm in devotion—The devotion to the Virgin—Beautiful passage of Dr. Wiseman—Possible abuse no argument—Palmer's inconsistency—Passages from the ancient fathers—How he explains them—His glaring perversion of authorities—His work of supererogation—Faith and practice of the early Church—Beauty and sublimity of the Catholic doctrine—Devotion to the Virgin—A golden chain.

GEOMETERS tell us of a curved line, which can never come in actual contact with a straight line, to which it nevertheless constantly approximates. This theorem in conic sections forcibly reminds us of the past relative positions of Puseyism and Catholicity. Though the former seemed for many years to be constantly approaching the latter, yet the range of its curvature never actually touched the straight line of Catholic truth. Whether the approximation will yet terminate in contact, in spite of mathematical rules, the future alone can reveal. One thing is certain, that if so auspicious a conjunction should ever take place, the result will be owing to a modification in the laws of the curve, and not to any change in the direction of the straight line; for truth moves always in a straight line, and it can never deflect either to the right or to the left, else it would cease to be truth.

Though the final issue of the Puseyite movement has not entirely been satisfactory, it has nevertheless exercised a beneficial influence on the religious mind of the age. It has awakened inquiry on the great and all important question of the CHURCH; it has aroused the attention of the sober and reflecting to the grievous evils of sectarianism, and to the vast

---

I. **Letters to N. Wiseman, D. D., on the Errors of Romanism, in respect to the worship of Saints, Satisfactions, Purgatory, Indulgences, and the Worship of Images and Relics.* By the Rev. William Palmer, M. A., of Worcester College, Oxford. Baltimore: Joseph Robinson. 1843.

II. *The Character of the Rev. William Palmer, M. A., of Worcester College, as a Controversialist; particularly with reference to his charge against Dr. Wiseman, of quoting, as genuine works of the Fathers, spurious and heretical productions, considered in a Letter to a Friend at Oxford.* By a late member of the University. From the London edition. Baltimore: Metropolitan Press. 1844. 12mo., pp. 96.

importance of religious unity; it has learnedly and eloquently set forth, in a new and more favorable light, many of the distinctive doctrines of Catholicity; it has stimulated men's minds to inquire into the principles and institutions of the ancient Church; it has kindled up in the hearts of many Protestants a new fervor to explore the (to them) hitherto hidden treasures of Christian antiquity: and it has thus greatly promoted patristic learning among those who, before, either entirely neglected this useful branch of study, or treated it even with positive contempt. Such have been the principal benefits of Puseyism.

But it has done yet more than this. It has already been instrumental in conducting many ingenuous and learned Protestants to the very portals, and some others into the inner sanctuary, of the venerable Catholic temple. Irresistibly led, by the course of reasoning upon which they had entered, to the conclusion that Catholicity and Christianity are identical, these individuals did not consult their own interests or worldly reputation; they did not confer with flesh and blood; but, spurning all mere human considerations, they straightway embraced what they believed to be the truth in Christ Jesus; they denied themselves, took up their cross, and followed their Saviour in the narrow path that leads to life, in which He had walked.

To check this ever increasing tendency towards Roman Catholicism among their immediate disciples, and to prove their own orthodoxy to their Protestant friends, some of the principal Puseyite leaders published works or pamphlets fraught with bitter enmity against Rome, and filled with declamations of a strong attachment to the "no-popery" principles of the Anglican establishment. They maintained that the Catholic Church is one thing, and "popery" another; or that there is a broad and clearly marked distinction between Catholicity as unfolded in its official and recognized formularies and standards, and Catholicity as it actually exists at present, with the open sanction of the Church authorities, in Catholic countries on the continent of Europe. The forms of prayer and of worship contained in the Missal and the Breviary, as well as the doctrinal definitions of the Council of Trent, were according to them, almost entirely unexceptionable, or, at least, susceptible of a sense in accordance with their own views; but the interpretation of that worship, and of those doctrinal definitions, and the system of religion embodying or based upon them in Roman Catholic countries, they professed to view with a holy horror, as strongly savoring of superstition, and even of idolatry. They were almost ready to receive the law; they objected to the commentary put upon it by the practice of the Church.

Of all the Puseyite leaders, perhaps the most active and efficient in laboring to establish this distinction between Catholicity and "popery," is the Rev. William Palmer, of Worcester College, Oxford. His letters to Dr. Wiseman on the "Errors of Romanism," have been hailed by Anglicans on both sides of the Atlantic, as a triumphant refutation of the Roman Catholic system. We are not disposed to deny to Mr. Palmer the credit of some learning, and of considerable ingenuity; we consider him no vulgar or common-place declaimer, but we cannot subscribe to the opinion that he is a very able controversialist, much less a sound or conclusive reasoner. We have already had occasion to show that he is not a correct or safe historian;[1] we shall now proceed to assign our reasons for believing that he is not a good theologian nor a sound logician. We hope to prove that his learning is much more apparent than real, and that his arguments are much more plausible than solid. All that we ask is an attentive and patient hearing; and we request it with the more confidence, as to accomplish our task it will not be necessary to go into any very lengthy investigation or any very tedious details. Mr. Palmer's learning as well as his arguments lie on the surface; and it will not be necessary to penetrate beyond the surface to establish the shallowness of the one, and the sophistry of the other. Strip his learning of all that it has borrowed from our most common-place theological, historical, and liturgical writers, and it will be meagre indeed;[2] strip his reasoning of its false assumptions and glaring sophistry, and it will appear weak and powerless, almost beyond expression.

The immediate occasion which induced the publication of the work under consideration, was the appearance of a letter of Dr. Wiseman to Prof. Newman of Oxford, in answer to certain charges preferred by the latter gentleman against the Catholic Church.[3] For some reason or other, Prof. Newman declined to answer this letter, and Mr. Palmer volunteered his services to answer it for him. He did not, however, confine himself to a mere answer, but he boldly charged the Catholic Church with encouraging and sanctioning idolatry among its members; and with derogating from, and practically denying the atonement of Christ, by its doctrines of satisfactions and indulgences.

To establish the former charge, to which we must confine our attention for the present, he alleged a number of passages from modern standard Catholic writers, and from received Catholic prayer-books; which, according to the interpretation he put upon them, teach that divine honors are given among Catholics to the saints, and especially to the Blessed Virgin. To this train of reasoning Dr. Wiseman replied in his "Remarks," by producing an array of passages from the ancient Greek and Latin fathers containing expressions of reverence for the saints, much stronger and "more offensive" than those to which Mr. Palmer had objected in Catholics of the present day. Mr. Palmer was seriously embarrassed; for he, too, professed an unbounded reverence for the doctrines taught by the ancient fathers, and for the usages of ancient Catholicity.

How did he extricate himself from the dilemma? He became desperate, and recklessly charged Dr. Wiseman with alleging, as genuine testimonies of the fathers, passages from spurious or heretical works! The accusation was as grave as it was unfounded. It was promptly met, and triumphantly answered by the writer, the title of whose work stands second on our list, at the beginning of this article. He entered into a learned and detailed examination of all the specifications made by Mr. Palmer in his fifth letter to Dr. Wiseman; and we think that no sober or impartial man can read attentively this able and searching critique, without being astonished at the utter recklessness of Mr. Palmer, and without repeating to himself the old adage: "A little learning is a dangerous thing."

---

[1] In the Review of his Compendious Church History

[2] See, for specifications under this head, and for proofs of Mr. Palmer's barefaced plagiarism, "The Character of Mr. Palmer as a Controversialist," p. 62, note, *et alibi passim*.

[3] It is almost unnecessary to state, that since this was written Dr. Newman has become a fervent Catholic.

We must be satisfied, for the present, with this general reference to the valuable little work which sets forth the character of Mr. Palmer as a controversialist; it is already before the American public, and it may speak for itself. To analyze its contents, and to enter fully into the merits of the literary and critical controversy between Mr. Palmer and Dr. Wiseman on patristic learning, would lead us much too far, and would greatly abridge, or wholly preclude, the line of investigation we propose to adopt.

Besides, we are content to waive this powerful argument from antiquity, and to confine ourselves to the examination of Mr. Palmer's reasoning, on its own intrinsic merits. The point at issue between us is just this: he maintains that the Roman Catholic Church of the present day, openly sanctions and practises idolatry; we boldly deny the charge, and pronounce his reasoning in support of it mere sophistry. He prefers, we indignantly repel, the Charge of Idolatry.[1]

After having adverted to the prejudices prevalent among Protestants against the Catholic Church, Mr. Palmer thus states the object he proposed to himself in writing these Letters to Dr. Wiseman:

> "It will be my endeavor, in the following pages, to show that public opinion is not so grossly mistaken in these matters as you would fain have us imagine, and that, while it would be undoubtedly most unjust to attribute superstitious and idolatrous notions or practices to those individuals of your communion who disclaim them for themselves, the stain adheres most deeply to the community at large, and that the Roman is, emphatically, a *corrupt* Church."[2]

Now, we are perfectly willing to abide by his own test, and we say to him in the language of the Gospel: "Out of thy own mouth I judge thee, thou wicked servant."[3] He admits that it were "most unjust to attribute superstitious and idolatrous notions or practices to those of our communion who disclaim them *for themselves.*" Well, we venture to assert that there is not in the wide world *a single Catholic*, male or female, gentle or simple, learned or unlearned, who does not expressly disclaim *for himself or herself* all superstitious and idolatrous notions and practices whatever; and we defy Mr. Palmer, or any one else, to prove the contrary. To prove it, however, mere declamation and vague assertion will not do; we must have certain and well authenticated *facts.*

---

[1] Mr. Palmer endeavors to prove the Charge of Idolatry chiefly in Letters I, V, and VIII.

[2] Letter I, p. 10.

[3] St. Luke, xix, [illegible].

A long residence in Italy, and a tolerably extensive acquaintance with the religious feelings and usages of the Italians, enables us to say, with unhesitating certainty, that no Catholic in that beautiful country ever dreamed of being an idolater; and that, if Mr. Palmer were to go there and prefer his charge, the veriest old woman of them all would laugh at him for his simplicity, and would pronounce him either a slanderer or a madman. We have had occasion to see this very experiment tried on an old Italian beggar-woman, and it resulted precisely as we have stated. If it be then an undoubted *fact,* that Catholics universally disclaim *for themselves* all practices of idolatry, Mr. Palmer, in preferring the charge against them, has proved himself guilty of the most grievous injustice, even according to his own showing.

But we are prepared to prove, that his specifications do not establish the grave and insulting accusation. They consist, as we have already intimated, of forms of invocation and prayer found in our prayer-books, in more or less extensive use amongst us, and of passages extracted from the writings of some of our standard authors. These he has torn from their connection, and wrested from their legitimate meaning, by a system of unnatural, exaggerated, and false interpretation. He has made them speak a language totally at variance with the intent and belief of those who employed them, thus thrusting down the throats of Catholics, in spite of all their protestations to the contrary, the odious charge of superstition and idolatry. This line of argument is unjust and unfair, on its very face. If there was, or could be any doubt as to the true meaning of those prayers or practices of piety, surely the interpretation put upon them by those persons among whom they are received and employed, should have some weight in settling their real signification. Any other canon of interpretation is delusive, unjust, and sophistical in the highest degree. What, for instance, would be thought of a system of interpretation which would put upon the thirty-nine articles, the homilies, and the liturgy of the Anglican church, a meaning directly at variance with that generally received among Anglicans? What would be thought of the reasoning employed by a political charlatan, to prove by isolated and garbled extracts from the proceedings of congress, and from the records of our courts and state legislatures, that the American people, as a body, are opposed to the great principles of her government embodied in our noble constitution? What, in fine, would be thought of a fanatic, who, by culling a text here, and another there, should endeavor to prove from the Bible a system of belief openly opposed to certain great principles which, as all Christians agree, are found in the Bible? Yet this course, iniquitous and absurd as it manifestly is, is precisely that adopted by Mr. Palmer to establish the Charge of Idolatry against the Catholic Church. And it is a sad thought, that a line of argument, which would be rejected with indignation in any other connection, should be deemed good enough, and even conclusive, against the oldest, the most numerous, and the most learned body of Christians in the world!

We can not, in one brief article, attempt to go into a minute and detailed examination of all the specifications made by our accuser, to establish against us the Charge of Idolatry. Nor do we deem it at all necessary to do so. We shall be content with offering three general remarks on them all; and, if we are not greatly mistaken, these will cover the whole ground of the controversy, and prove Mr. Palmer's entire argument to be little better than a shallow sophism from beginning to end. We lay down, then, and will undertake to prove the three following propositions:

I. The true meaning of the passages objected by Mr. Palmer is clearly settled by our recognized formularies, and by the *universally* received doctrine and worship of our Church; there can be no reasonable doubt, or even cavil about this; and this being once proved, the Charge of Idolatry falls of itself to the ground.

II. The objected passages are generally either fully explained by the context, or they fully explain themselves.

III. In answering arguments alleged in support of Catholic doctrines, and in explaining passages from the fathers, Mr. Palmer himself adopts the very line of interpretation, which he so much objects to in Catholics.

We hope to prove all these positions in succession.

I. Mr. Palmer admits more than once, that our recognized formularies do not sanction idolatry. Thus he says: "Their formularies do not (I believe) teach or enjoin idolatry, and yet idolatry is taught and practised; that is, Romanism is more corrupt than its own formularies."[1] He should have said, that our formularies not only "do not teach or enjoin idolatry," but that they expressly, and unequivocally, and repeatedly condemn it, and protest against it; and that if, notwithstanding all this, idolatry is "taught and practised" in the Church, it is in direct opposition both to the spirit and to the letter of the formularies themselves.

Take, for instance, the following explicit declarations on the subject, made by the Council of Trent:[2]

> "The Holy Synod enjoins upon all bishops and others having the office and charge of teaching others, that, according to the usage of the Catholic and apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and according to the consent of the holy fathers, and the decrees of sacred councils, they should, in the first place, diligently instruct the faithful concerning the intercession and invocation of saints, the honor of relics, and the legitimate use of images, teaching them that the saints, reigning together with Christ, offer up their prayers to God for men, that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to fly to their prayers, aid, and assistance, in order *to obtain favor from God through his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord*, WHO IS OUR ONLY REDEEMER AND SAVIOUR. . . (Let them also teach) that the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints, are to be kept and retained, especially in the churches,

---

[1] Letter V, p. 4. See also Letter I, p. 30, and p. 12.

[2] Sessio xxv. Decretum de Invocatione, Veneratione, et Reliquiis Sanctorum, et Sacris Imaginibus

and that to them due honor and veneration are to be paid; *not that any virtue or divinity is to be believed to be inherent in them, or that any thing is to be asked of them, or that confidence is to be placed in images*, as was done of old by the gentiles, who reposed their hope in idols, but because *the honor which is shown them is referred to the prototypes which they represent;* so that through the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head and kneel down, *we adore Christ, and venerate the saints whom they represent. . . But let all superstition in the invocation of saints, and in the veneration and sacred use of relics and images, be entirely abolished.* . . Finally, let so great diligence and care be exhibited by the bishops concerning these things, that nothing inordinate, nothing preposterously or tumultuously ordered, nothing profane, nothing immodest, should appear, since 'holiness becometh the house of God.' That these things may be the more faithfully observed, the Holy Synod decrees, that it shall not be lawful for any one to set up, or cause to be set up, in any place or church, no matter what exemption it may plead, any unusual image, unless it shall have been approved of by the bishop; *and that no new miracles are to be admitted, and no new relics to be received,* except with the recognition and approval of the bishop."

If this be not an explicit and solemn disclaimer of all superstition and idolatry, by the highest tribunal of our Church, we know not what would be considered as such. And to charge a Church with superstition and idolatry, which thus solemnly disclaims both, and takes every possible precaution to preclude both, is, we apprehend, atrociously unjust; however much it may suit the purposes of a mere isolated handful of men, who would, forsooth, claim to be "the church Catholic," while they are actively engaged in slandering *the* Catholic Church.

But this is not yet all. The Missal and the Breviary are the standard and official organs of Catholic worship; and the Missal and the Breviary have not only not a shadow of superstition and idolatry, but they expressly and repeatedly exclude both. Mr. Palmer has, in fact, presented not one objectionable passage from either of them; as he would certainly have done, had he been of the opinion that ingenuity could have tortured their meaning into the expression of any idolatrous sentiment. The prayers contained in both these liturgical works, even those in which the Blessed Virgin and the saints are commemorated and invoked, are, without a single exception, addressed *directly* to God, and ask blessings *directly* from God, through the virtues and intercession of his saints; and they all explicitly recognize the one mediatorship of Christ, by terminating with the well known words, "Through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour," or words of similar import.

And yet, with all this continual and unequivocal protest against every species of superstition and idolatry; with all these daily and hourly recognitions of Christ's sole mediatorship of salvation; with all these solemn declarations of our general councils and recognized formularies of worship staring him in the face, Mr. Palmer could still find it in his heart to charge idolatry on the Catholic Church! O shame! Well may we administer to him and to his admirers the implied rebuke which the energetic and saintly St. Jerome administered to Vigilantius, who preferred the same charge against the Church, and on precisely the same grounds, fifteen hundred years ago: "*Idolatras appellas hujuscemodi homines?* Do you dare call such men as these idolaters?"

In fact, the arguments of Mr. Palmer are as old and as threadbare, as is the accusation itself, which they are intended to sustain. Both had been alleged, and *better* alleged, and refuted, too, at least a thousand times already! "Romanism" has had much more redoubtable opponents than even Mr. Palmer; they have all disappeared; but "Romanism" still bravely stands its ground, and still proudly maintains its high position. And it will stand, should the world last so long, for thousands of years after Mr. Palmer and his admirers shall have descended to the tomb, and been entirely forgotten.

The whole force of Mr. Palmer's objections rests on a total misapprehension and misrepresentation of the nature, and of the whole end and aim of the Catholic doctrine in regard to the honor and invocation of saints. Why are the saints honored? Why are they invoked? It is simply and only because they are the favorites of Christ and the friends of God.

They are not honored on account of any inherent qualities or merits which they possess independently of God, or of Christ Jesus, *their* Redeemer; all that they have, they have received from God through Jesus Christ; they are but bright mirrors from which are reflected the attributes of the Deity; they have, they claim, they receive veneration for no other privilege than this. Every religious honor that is paid to them, then, is paid solely on account of supernatural gifts imparted to them by God, and consequently every such honor *necessarily* redounds to the glory of God. God is honored in his servants, and every act of veneration to the saints is based on, and is elicited by, the claim of the Deity to supreme adoration from all His creatures. This is the true Catholic doctrine, as clearly developed in all our official definitions of faith, and as universally understood among us. Where is the idolatry that lurks beneath it? It not only does not enjoin, but, in its very nature and essence, it positively excludes all idolatry.

Again, why are the saints invoked? Have they, of themselves, and independently of the merits of Christ, any power to assist us in obtaining spiritual succor or salvation? Assuredly not. No Catholic ever dreamed that they had. The one mediatorship of Christ is a cardinal principle of Catholic faith and practice. It reaches everywhere, and its influence is felt throughout the whole of Catholic theology. It is the sun of the Catholic system; the great source of light and heat. Without it, the Christian world would be in a more hopeless and gloomy condition than would be the material universe, were the sun stricken from our system; there would be no life; all would be gloom, and dreariness, and coldness, and desolation. The saints were themselves saved by the atoning merits and blood of Christ; they can aid in saving others only by and through the same great atonement. This is precisely the reason why all our public liturgical formularies of invocation addressed to the saints, terminate with the clause "Through Jesus Christ," &c.

Such being plainly our doctrine and authorized practice, every act of invocation of the saints is a solemn recognition of the one mediatorship of Christ; and it not only does not contain one element of idolatry or of superstition, but it positively and *necessarily* excludes both. And Mr. Palmer's effort to extract idolatry out of such a doctrine, is about as wise and conclusive as would be the effort to prove that mankind do not believe the sun to be the great source of light and heat, from the fact that they sometimes make use of artificial means to produce them!

Let us apply these undoubted principles to a few of Mr. Palmer's specifications, alleged to prove the idolatry of the Roman Catholic Church. To show that we are in the habit of paying to the Virgin honors due to God alone, he produces the following passage from the encyclical letter of the late venerable Pontiff:

> "We address this letter to you, on this most joyful day, when we solemnize the festival of the triumphant assumption of the holy Virgin into heaven, that she whom we have acknowledged as our patroness and deliverer amongst the greatest calamities, may propitiously assist us while we write, and by her *celestial inspiration* may guide us to such councils as may be most salutary to the Christian Church."[1]

One must be very keen-sighted, indeed, to discover aught of idolatry in this passage. In different parts of the encyclical letter, the Pontiff distinctly recognizes the great mystery of the atonement, and that of the one mediatorship of Christ, and we are quite sure that he must have been greatly astonished, if he ever chanced to hear that a cunning seer of Oxford was able so far to penetrate into his most hidden thoughts as to discover in them a lurking propensity to idolatry, of which he was wholly unconscious. It was natural enough for the holy Pontiff to allude to the great festival on which his letter was dated, and to feel *inspired* by a theme so lofty as the triumphant glory of Mary in heaven. Could not the Virgin aid and assist him, by her prayers to her divine Son? Could she not obtain for him from that Son a heavenly inspiration? To prefer the charge of idolatry in such a case, manifests about as much wisdom in interpretation, as would be shown by a cynic who should charge one of our Fourth-of-July orators with downright idolatry, merely because, kindling with the fervor of his theme, he happened to say that he was *inspired* by the virtues and patriotism of Washington!

Nor does our stern censor exhibit greater discretion, when he tortures the following invocation of the guardian angel into idolatry: "Angel of God, who art my guardian, enlighten me, who am committed to thee, with heavenly piety; guard, direct, and govern me."[2]

We apprehend, that if one man may "enlighten, guard, direct, and govern" another, those "ministering spirits, who are sent to minister for them who shall receive the inheritance of salvation,"[3] may surely discharge similar offices towards us. Else what is the proper office of those guardian angels, so often spoken of in the inspired volume? Do they not communicate with, and act upon our spirits, imparting to them enlightenment and holy influence? Or are we to believe it idolatry to assert, that God sometimes acts through secondary causes? Mr. Palmer must have been sadly at a loss for evidence, when he alleged this beautiful prayer as an instance of Catholic idolatry.

---

[1] Letter I, p. 15.

[2] Ibid. p. 22.

[3] Hebrews, i, 14.

He seems to have been similarly straitened, when he objected to the appropriate and touching prayer of Cardinal Bona to the angels, and especially to St. Michael, "the prince of the celestial army."[1] Surely Michael, who fought with the dragon and conquered him, has not lost any of his power, but he can still triumph over Lucifer, whenever the latter dares assail the people of God. Like his first, his last victory will redound to the glory of God, from whom all his strength is derived; and there is, and there can be no idolatry in the case. In both triumphs his motto is contained in his name itself: "Who is like unto God?"

II. But we go a step farther, and maintain that the most "offensive" passages alleged by Mr. Palmer, as instances of "Romish" idolatry, either clearly explain themselves, or are sufficiently explained by the connection in which they are found, so as not only not to sanction, but expressly to exclude the least shadow of idolatry. Take, for example, the prayer to the Virgin, upon which he insists so strongly:

> "We fly to thy protection, holy Mother of God, despise not our prayers in our necessities, but deliver us at all times from all evils (*dangers?*), glorious and blessed Virgin."[2]

This prayer, he himself tells us, is placed at the conclusion of the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, at every petition of which there occurs the significant *pray for us;* which explicitly sets forth the manner in which she is expected to *protect* us in our necessities, and to *deliver* us from danger. In the Litany itself, the distinction between prayer to God and prayer to the Virgin, is openly made and clearly marked. When God is addressed, the petition is *Have mercy on us;* when the Virgin is addressed, it is *Pray for us.* Was it ingenuous or fair in Mr. Palmer to conceal this obvious and palpable *fact,* of which he must have been fully cognizant?

Nor is he more candid in adducing as idolatrous a prayer of Cardinal Bona to the Virgin, the most objectionable part of which is contained in the following passage, according to his translation:

> "Behold I fall down before thee, most gracious Virgin; I fall down and worship in thee thy Son, and I implore thy suffrages (prayers) to obtain that my sins may be blotted out, to reconcile the heart of thy Son to my heart, that He may possess me, and make me a man according to His heart."[3]

This prayer speaks for itself, and whatever a Protestant may think of it, he can not certainly charge it with being idolatrous. The supreme adoration is evidently paid, not to Mary, but to her Son who dwells in the heart of Mary; and He, and not she, is evidenly the end and object of the prayer. Mary is merely asked *to obtain, by her prayers* to her Son, the remission of the petitioner's sins, and the perfect union of his heart with that of Christ. Where is the idolatry in all this?

---

[1] Letter I, p. 23.

[2] Ibid. p. 16.

[3] Ibid. p. 17

We are next treated to a specimen of gross idolatry, in the shape of an incident recorded in the life of St. Alphonsus Liguori, who, while preaching "on his favorite subject, *the intercession and patronage of Mary*," had his countenance irradiated with a heavenly light, and was honored by a vision of the Virgin herself; who appeared to him and to the immense crowd then assembled in the church of Foggia, in the guise of a girl of fourteen or fifteen years of age, with her beautiful face all beaming with heavenly grace and light.[1] Mr. Palmer may laugh at this miracle, but it will be much more difficult for him to disprove it, in the face of the sworn testimony of the thousands who witnessed it. Be it, however, as it may, the occurrence furnishes not the slightest evidence of idolatry; nay, it expressly excludes all idolatry; for the passage opens with the declaration that St. Liguori was preaching on the *intercession and patronage* of the Virgin. The meaning of these terms cannot be mistaken; it was apparent to every one of his hearers; and there could have been no danger whatever that any of them would be led to commit idolatry. How would it sound to say, *the intercession and patronage of God?* Has Mr. Palmer ever read the voluminous writings of St. Liguori on this very subject, which he treats in all its details? If he has, then he must *know*, that the saint was not guilty of idolatry at this or at any other time. If he has not read them, any farther than a few isolated pages here and there, then he surely has no right to pronounce any opinion on the subject.

Mr. Palmer is greatly scandalized at the devotion of another among our modern saints to the Blessed Virgin. He can not for his life understand, how the seraphic St. Francis di Girolamo should have entertained so tender a reverence for the pure and spotless Mother of his God. Should he think proper to extend his reading in hagiology, he will ascertain that this was not a trait of character peculiar to St. Francis, but that all the most fervent and eminent saints of God, from St. John the Evangelist down to those of our own day, were remarkable for this same tenderly reverent feeling towards the Virgin. Taking this wider view of the subject, he may perhaps be prepared to understand the sentiment ascribed to St. Francis di Girolamo, that "a person can hardly be saved who feels *no* devotion to the Virgin Mother of God." For how can such a person love and worship the Son, while he treats the Mother with open coolness or contempt? Will Christ receive graciously the homage of one who thus openly spurns the Mother that bore Him, to whom He was "subject" while on earth, and whom He remembered so tenderly while expiring on the cross? No; we heartily subscribe to the opinion of St. Francis di Girolamo; and we concur with Mr. Palmer in believing that the passage in the saint's life, which records this and similar sentiments,

---

[1] Ibid. pp. 18, 19.

"speaks for itself."[1] He is entirely welcome to all the argument, which even *his* ingenuity can extract from such declarations.

In his desperate effort to fasten the charge of idolatry upon the Catholic Church, Mr. Palmer once more takes up the late Pope's encyclical letter, from which he extracts the following glaringly idolatrous passage:

> "We will also *earnestly beseech* with humble prayers from (*of?*) the prince of the apostles, Peter, and from (*of?*) his co-apostle, Paul, *that you may stand as a wall*, that no other foundation may be laid but that which has been laid. Relying on this delightful hope, we trust that the Author and Finisher of our faith, Jesus Christ, will at length console us in all our tribulations."[2]

We have retained Mr. Palmer's italics in this extract, as they present a very curious, though a tolerably fair specimen of his method of reasoning. We apprehend, that the phrases italicised are meant for those which contain the idolatrous sentiment; but, for the life of us, we cannot understand how there could be aught of idolatry in the Pontiff's praying to the blessed Peter and Paul, that they might obtain from the "Author and Finisher of our faith, Jesus Christ," the grace to enable the bishops, their successors in the ministry, "to stand as a wall," sharing in their own invincible firmness and constancy in the faith. He is so far from even hinting that divine honors are to be paid to SS. Peter and Paül, that he expressly states the precise contrary, in language as explicit as he could possibly have employed. Does he not refer to the passage from St. Paul: "that no other foundation is to be laid but that which is laid, Christ Jesus?" Does he not look for consolation from Him who is "the Author and Finisher of our faith?" Does he not exult over the "delightful hope," that his brother bishops will continue steadfast in asserting this *only* foundation of their faith? Verily, our Oxford divine was unfortunate in his selection of an "offensive" passage, in the present instance; his usual acuteness seems to have wholly abandoned him; he exibits a strong propensity to reason by contraries, and to allege passages which not only explain themselves, but prove by the precise reverse of what he intended!

We are almost tired of exposing the transparent sophistry, and the disingenuous special pleading of our accuser; but we must yet refer to one more objected passage, which he places at the close of his fifth letter,[3] as a sort of climax to his argument on "Romish" idolatry. The very rehearsal of the passage seems to have frozen his soul with horror; he breaks off suddenly, and can not find courage to offer any comments on a "scene so awful." Surely now, if ever, he has found out an undeniable specimen of genuine idolatry: men will shudder on reading it; and no ingenuity can defend, or even palliate its atrocity. And yet, what will be your surprise, gentle reader, on discovering that this is no instance of idolatry after all; that it is not so strong even as many other passages which he had alleged with less flourish of trumpets; and that it fully and explicitly explains itself! It is taken from the writings of St. Liguori, and contains advices to the priest who attends persons in their last agony. Here is the concluding portion of the passage, with Mr. Palmer's significant and *very sensible* italics:

---

[1] Ibid. p. 20.
[2] Ibid. p. 21.
[3] Page 50.

> "When the sick man is near expiring, the (following) acts should be recited *without pausing, and in a loud voice* (by the priest): Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. My God, help me; permit me to come and love thee for ever. My Jesus, my love, I love thee. I repent. I wish that I had never offended thee! *O Mary, my hope,* help me, pray for me to Jesus. My Jesus, for thy passion, save me. I love thee. *Mary, my mother,* in this hour help me. *St. Joseph,* help me. *Archangel Michael,* defend me. *Guardian angel,* guard me. *Saint N.* (here let the principal patron of the sick man be named), commend me to Jesus Christ. *Saints of God,* intercede for me. Jesus, Jesus, Jesus. Jesus *and Mary,* I give my heart and my soul to you."

If there be any idolatry in all this, we confess we cannot discover wherein it lies. We cannot even see on what ground Mr. Palmer objects to it; for we are under the impression that he is not entirely opposed to a moderate invocation of the saints. The ejaculations given above expressly exclude everything that savors of idolatry: they ask Jesus to *save us,* and Mary and the saints to *pray for us.* In the name of all that is reasonable, how can this be tortured into idolatry? We commend the discretion of Mr. Palmer in offering no comments on this passage, and "in leaving his readers to their own reflections." Discretion has been deemed the better portion of valor by every boasting pugilist, from the memorable days of Jack Falstaff down to our own more degenerate times!

In interpreting Catholic prayers to the Virgin and the saints, Mr. Palmer has fallen into many grievous errors. Not only has he shown no regard whatever to the well known and universally promulgated doctrines of the Catholic Church on the subject, but he has paid no attention to the devotional feelings, and made no allowance for the the tender and thrilling emotions, which often give rise to and accompany the recital of those prayers. Of course, we could not have expected of him, as an Englishman and a Protestant, any great warmth of religious temperament, nor any great amount of sympathy with those who feel more deeply on religious subjects than himself: but we had reason to expect that he should, at least, have kept this circumstance steadily in view, while laboring to get at the real meaning of prayers uttered under its influence. But sorely has he disappointed us in this so reasonable a hope. He has interpreted the warm, ardent, and poetic prayer of the enthusiastic Italian, by the same canon which he would have employed to explain that of the cold, phlegmatic, and unimpressible Englishman. Is this fair? Is no allowance to be made for the poetry of religious feeling; for the enthusiasm which fills the soul to overflowing, and gushes forth in speech animated and kindling with its own ardent fervor? Is it fair or reasonable to interpret such a prayer with the same rigor, as if the worshiper had coolly weighed beforehand every word that he used, and been careful to employ no term that was not strictly sober and correct, and in full accordance with the letter of his creed? Is it to be supposed that Catholics mean to make, whenever they pray, a full and detailed theological profession of their faith? Is it to be thought that they, on all occasions, take precautions against the captious cavils of cynics, or that they pray as if they believed themselves under the constant espionage of envenomed critics, ready to catch up every incautious word they may utter, to tear it from its connection, and to extract from it, with a sneer of triumph, something like a plausible proof of idolatry? If Mr. Palmer looks for all this in Catholic worshipers, he expects more than we would wish to find in them, and more than is compatible with human nature itself. Give us warm devotional feeling, even if it sometimes appear to become exaggerated, rather than that cold, caviling piety, which seems always uneasy and trembling, lest it should be transported too far, and be led to say or do too much. Give us rather the religion of the heart, than that of the head. Give us too much, rather than too little piety. Let our religious thermometer be rather at boiling heat, than stand freezing below zero. Give us even an exaggerated reverence for the saints and for the blessed Mother of God, rather than no reverence at all. The land which produces luxuriantly and superabundantly, is a good and rich soil; but that which produces nothing but thorns and thistles, is barren, and "nigh to a curse."

One great proof to our minds, that Protestantism is not the religion of Christ, and that it has not the spirit of Christ, is the notorious fact, that Protestants have no love, no tender feeling of reverence for the saints or for the blessed Mother of Christ. Protestantism will not only not aid in fulfilling the prediction of the inspired Virgin, "That henceforth all generations should call her *blessed*," but they are in the habit of sneering at those who alone fulfill it! They have not a particle of that deep and filial reverence, which the beloved disciple of Jesus ever cherished towards the blessed Mother of his dear Lord, who had been given to him, and, in his person, to all the cherished friends of Jesus, as a tender and loving Mother.

Which, we would ask, exhibits itself the true Church of Christ; the one that tenderly loves and reverences His mother, or the one that treats her with coolness and contempt, and can scarcely hear her name even pronounced, without an involuntary shudder of horror? We put this question to all Protestants, and especially to the admirers of Mr. Palmer. And, to enable them the more readily to answer it, we commend to their serious reflection the following beautiful passage from the pen of the distinguished champion of Catholicity, against whom Mr. Palmer wrote his letters:

> "It has often struck us, that many who, in latter times, have not scrupled to use the coldest and even disrespectful language respecting *her*, would shrink from the idea of acting similarly towards her, had they lived in her day, and had her near. When, particularly, we have heard the indignation of fancied zeal break from female lips, against any respect being paid, or devotion expressed towards her who is the peerless glory, the matchless jewel of her sex, we have been led to think how differently the heart that gave the tongue such utterance would have felt, had its

compassion been claimed by the venerable matron, whose bereavement of the best of sons had been caused for its sake. Many who can speak unkindly of her in heaven, would have melted with compassion over her on earth; would have kissed with deep reverential awe the hand that had lifted from the ground, and received into the maternal embrace, the same sacred body, just born, and just dead — the infant and the corpse: and would have deemed it a privilege inestimable, if granted them, to listen, low upon the ground, to her many tales of joy and of sorrow — glowing in her delight, and softening in her griefs, and exulting in her triumphs. That some holy souls partook of such happiness, there can be no doubt. During the years that she survived her Son, she conversed with His and her friends, an object surely of affectionate regard and deep veneration. And of what would she discourse so willingly, or so well, as of Him of whom her breast was ever full? Or how could they express their love better than by making Him their theme? How easily does the imagination depict the scene of some faithful follower, like Luke, anxious to have accurate knowledge of all things from the beginning, making inquiries concerning the earlier period of our Lord's life; and then listening to the marvelous history most sweetly told — how fair and reverent the archangel came, and how her heart fluttered when she heard his salutation, and her soul overflowed with consciousness of unheard of grace as she accepted his errand: how wonderfully Elizabeth greeted her; and how their infants mysteriously rejoiced in mutual recognition; how that cold December night was warmed and brightened by the first appearance of her God-like Child, and her breast was enraptured with heavenly delights as He thrice drew forth His first early nourishment; how holy Simeon proclaimed His dignity, and showed Him honor in the temple; and how her three days' tears were dried up, when she found her lost Son sitting, mild and radiant with celestial wisdom, amidst the old men of the law. What looks, what emotions accompany the recital? With what breathless respect is it drunk in by the future evangelist? Or we may fancy John, more privileged to tread upon that tenderer ground, on which both have walked together — the path of the cross — on some sad anniversary, dwelling with her on each afflicting event, recalling faithfully every sacred word, till she voluntarily felt, over again, the sword of grief which had pierced her soul. And then would he not change the theme, and pass over to the bright Sunday morning, which saw Him rise from the grave to comfort the sharers of His sufferings, and how He mounted before them all to His proper seat at the Father's right hand, and thence sent down His Holy Spirit on them? And who would now restrain her thoughts from following Him in spirit thither, and casting up a wistful glance towards the resting-place for which she longed, in which she saw Him, her Sovereign Love, prepared to receive and crown her, when the fullness of her time shall be complete, and the perfection of her patience manifested?"[1]

We do not deny the possibility of the devotion to the Blessed Virgin and the saints being carried too far, in some particular instance; but we maintain that such excesses, while they presuppose a sound religious feeling, are wholly unauthorized by the Catholic Church, which is surely not to be held responsible for the mistakes or the exaggerated piety of individuals. We do not deny that some abuses may exist, but we maintain that they do not justify the charge of idolatry or superstition against the

---

[1] Dublin Review — Art. Minor Rites and Offices.

Church, and that those "who strain at such gnats of abuses (taking them at the very worst), and justify themselves for swallowing the camel of schism, — aye, and with a good haunch of heresy on it," act, to say the least, very unwisely. Such persons might have been scandalized in Christ himself because of the weakness and imperfections of His early disciples, and they might have abandoned Him altogether, in consequence of the treachery of Judas! This bitter caviling spirit is as unchristian and pharisaic, as it is unreasonable and absurd.

III. Such, however, is precisely the spirit which guided Mr. Palmer in preparing his Letters against Dr. Wiseman, on the "Errors of Romanism." We will now proceed to prove, that this champion laureate of Anglicanism is as inconsistent, as we have already shown him to be illogical. To answer the arguments of Dr. Wiseman in support of Catholic doctrines and usages, and to explain away the strong passages alleged by him from the holy Scriptures and the fathers, he employs the *very same* method of interpretation, which he so strongly reprehends in Catholics in explaining the meaning of their own prayers to the Virgin and the saints! Who would have believed the redoubtable clerical knight of Oxford capable of this paltry manœuvering and of this disingenuous double dealing? Yet such is undoubtedly the fact, as we now proceed to show by a few specifications.

Mr. Palmer had strongly objected to addressing God and the saints in the same form of prayer, and he had unhesitatingly pronounced this practice idolatrous. To meet the objection, Dr. Wiseman alleged the remarkable passage from the Old Testament, in which the following words occur: "And all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads and *worshiped the Lord and the king*,"[1] (David). This was a case precisely in point. Had the congregation been Catholic, or had the writer who recorded the incident, been a Catholic, Mr. Palmer would have greedily seized on the words of the passage as a first rate specimen of "Romish" idolatry. The Catholic would have answered: "You do us injustice; we did not mean to render the same honor to the king as to the Lord." "It matters not," the Oxfordite would have answered; "what right had you to employ the same act of worship for both?" And yet, would you believe it, gentle reader, Mr. Palmer, to explain away the difficulty presented by this text, refers to the context, and, in a word, resorts to the very species of interpretation which he will not suffer Catholics to adopt in explaining their own *present* meaning, and in defending themselves from the odious charge of idolatry![2] What are we to think of the logic and consistency of such a controversialist?

He falls into the same glaring inconsistency, in attempting to explain away the following strong passage from St. Justin Martyr: "Him (God) and his Son who came from him, and taught us those things, and *the army of good angels who follow and resemble him*, and the spirit of prophecy,

---

[1] Paralipomenon or Chronicles xxix, 20, 21.

[2] Letter V, pp. 20, 21.

we venerate and adore."[1] True, he suggests another, and we think a very unwarrantable translation of the passage; but the burden of his answer is, "the angels are not *really* joined 'under the same form of expression' with God; for, as the Benedictine editors remark, the word *venerate* refers to the angels, and *adore* (προσκυνοῦμεν) to God." That is, he, following the Bendictine editors, felt that such *must* have been St. Justin's meaning,—though this is not clearly implied in the context,—because the philosopher martyr proved himself in his other writings to be entirely averse to every species of idolatry. What a pity that he did not think of this canon of interpretation, while he was so fiercely expounding the idolatrous language of Pope Gregory XVI., and of St. Liguori! We venture to say that no modern Pope, nor saint, nor Catholic divine, has ever employed language half so strong or so "offensive" as that of St. Justin; and that if he had been a *modern* instead of an *ancient* "Romish" saint, Mr. Palmer would scarcely have let him off so easily.

Again: Dr. Wiseman had alleged the following passage from St. Basil's homily on the forty martyrs: "These are they who, having obtained a place amongst us (their relics were deposited in the church of Cæsarea), like *continual towers, afford security* from the incursions of the enemies." Mr. Palmer expounds it:

> "That is, their memory and *example* was calculated to encourage Christians against the assaults of heresies and evil spirits."[2]

We suppose the father meant something more than this; at any rate the Oxford divine softens down his literal meaning to suit his own views, and in doing so unwittingly applies the very mode of explanation which he will not allow Catholics to use in much more obvious cases.

In a similar way he responds to almost every passage adduced by Dr. Wiseman from the fathers. If an epitaph, placed on the tomb of a martyr, solicits his *prayers* or his *intercession* for his friends yet on earth, it is a mere *poetical* fiction, not designed to mean any thing; or a pious exaggeration of tender friendship![3] If such ancient writers as Gaudentius, Venantius, St. Leo, St. Chrysostom, and St. Maximus, frequently employ the terms *patronage* and *protection*, in reference to the prayers of the saints for their earthly petitioners,[4] they must have meant to convey no reprehensible idea; but if modern Catholics dare use the same expressions in precisely the same connection, they are clearly guilty of superstition and idolatry! If St. Gregory of Nyssa assures us "that a person, by saying, '*holy Ephrem, help* (assist) *me*,' escaped from a dangerous position,"[5] Mr. Palmer tells us, that "such an expression does not interfere with the divine attributes;"[6] but if a Catholic of modern times dare employ such language, or if a Catholic writer dare record such a miracle, we would probably never hear the end of it! If St. Gregory Nazianzen employs strong language on the invocation of saints, "it is plainly rhetorical;"[7] and if St. John Chrysostom, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Basil, and St.

---

[1] St. Justin M. Apologia I. p. 11, ed. Thirlby, apud Palmer, Letter V. p 22.
[2] Letter V, p. 26. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid. p. 27. [5] Palmer ib. [6] Ibid. [7] Ibid. p. 28.

Ambrose, all strongly advocate the honor and invocation of saints,[1] it all proves nothing; for they did not intend, like modern "Romanists," to give divine honors to any but God, and they clearly laid down the distinction (which "Romanists," now-a-days, as clearly do) between the veneration to be paid to saints, and the adoration to be rendered to God alone! Such is the logic, such the consistency, such the fairness, such the justice of Mr. Palmer!

We might comment on many more instances of a similar kind; but these will suffice for our present purpose, and we must hasten on. From what we have thus far said, our readers will be able to form an opinion on Mr. Palmer's merits as a logician; from what we will now proceed briefly to show, they may judge of his candor and honesty in stating facts and in quoting authorities. We might produce many instances of his utter recklessness in these respects; many are produced by the author of "his character as a controversialist;" but we must be content with two to which that writer does not refer.

The first of these is a glaring, though we do not say, a willful mistranslation of a passage of Origen.[2] The error consists in substituting in the translation *angels* for *demons*, in order to wrest the words of the author into a meaning opposed to the veneration of angels. If he read Origen in the original, he must have perceived that he draws a broad distinction between good angels, whose office is the guardianship of mankind, and bad angels or demons, such as the pagans worshiped. His pagan opponent — Celsus — advocated this latter species of worship, and Origen argues against it with force and severity. According to Mr. Palmer's translation, his argument would have neither point nor meaning. What are we to think of a man who thus glaringly perverts the meaning of the plainest language?

The other instance consists in a very disingenuous reference to Bellarmine, to prove

> "That people may, according to the doctrine of Alexander de Hales, Thomas Aquinas, Cajetan, Buonaventura, Marsilius, Almayn, Carthusianus, Capreolus, Vasquez, and a host of our most approved writers, pay the worship of *latria* or *divine honor* to the images of Christ."[3]

Now, what will be thought of his accuracy, when on turning to Bellarmine we find no mention whatever of *Vasquez;* and what of his candor when we find that Bellarmine explains this very opinion in such a way as to exclude all shadow of idolatry,[4] and that moreover he refutes it at considerable length in two successive chapters![5] Why did he conceal these important circumstances? Is this manner of quotation either fair or honest? Is it right to leave on the mind of the reader the impression, that the author quoted says precisely the contrary of what he does really say? Is not the *suppressio veri* almost as dishonest a device, as the *suggestio falsi?*

---

[1] Palmer. p. 28.

[2] Contra Celsum, lib. viii, 26. The original of the passage referred to is: Απατε τη την του Κελσου συμβουλην λεγοντος προσευκτεον ειναι ΔΑΙΜΟΣΙ, which he translates: "Away with the advice of Celsus, saying that we should pray to *angels*." (Lett. V, p. 42.) We apprehend that Celsus never could have given such advice. See Dublin Review, vol. xvi, pp. 844, 845.

[3] Letter I, p. 23. His reference to Bellarmine is—De Imag. II. 20.

[4] C. xxiii, where he proves that the advocates of this opinion mean by the worship of *latria* paid to the images of Christ, a worship *improprie dictum et per accidens.* Vol. ii, p. 409. Edit. Venetiis, 1721, in 6 vols folio.

[5] Ch. xxii and xxiv.

We have yet one more remark to offer concerning Mr. Palmer's polemical tactics, as displayed in these "Letters on Romanism" He often makes a very strange use of his index and second-hand learning; in fact, he sometimes wastes it entirely. Thus he devotes no less than *fifteen* closely printed pages of his fifth Letter[1] to a mass of testimony from the ancient fathers, all showing, according to his opinion, that modern Romanism is idolatrous! And what, think you, is the drift of nearly all those passages? Almost all of them go to prove, what no one denies, that divine honors are to be given to God alone, and not to any creature! Every modern "Romanist" in the world admits this; it is explicitly stated in all our catechisms and prayer books; and it was surely a work of supererogation in Mr. Palmer to attempt to prove it by so great an array of learning. He might as well have undertaken to accumulate passages from the fathers proving the divinity of Christ, with a view to show that Roman Catholics of the present day are guilty of idolatry!

But does Mr. Palmer deny — can he deny — that, during the first ages of the Church, the honor and invocation of saints and martyrs were almost universal; and that the holiest men of that period adopted the practice, without ever once dreaming that it was idolatrous? Does he not himself admit that, as early at least as the fourth century, this practice was not unusual with the "pious fathers;" and that "the same affection, the same veneration, with which the spirits of the saints and martyrs were regarded by the *early* Christians, attended their earthly remains?"[2] And with what show of reason can he blame modern Catholics for imitating examples so illustrious and so hallowed? Can he, in a word, refute the evidence accumulated by an able writer in a late number of the Dublin Review, who conclusively proves the following positions on the subject: "That for a long time prior to the council of Chalcedon, (A. D. 451) Christians believed that it was lawful,

"1. To invoke the saints, not only asking their prayers, but in the direct manner which in modern Catholics is considered idolatrous.

"2. To have confidence in their patronage and protection.

"3. To make pilgrimages to their tombs, and to expect both temporal and eternal blessings in consequence.

"4. To believe that miracles were wrought by their relics.

"5. To show their veneration for their relics by external actions, as prostrations, &c.

"6. To address the Blessed Virgin in particular as the greatest of all saints; in other words, to give her the worship of hyper-dulia.

"And finally, that these things were then as *universally* and as *frequently* practised as in our own times."[3]

---

[1] Pp. 29-44.

[2] Compendious Ecclesiastical History, p. 68 seq. New York, 1841.

[3] Dublin Review, vol. xvi, pp. 343, 344. We refer our readers to the mass of patristic learning thrown together in the article of which the above extract is a summary. Those who will read the paper must be convinced that every one of the above positions has been triumphantly sustained.

If these facts be true, and they cannot be refuted, one of two things must be said; either that the Church of Christ was generally infected with idolatry from the very earliest period, or that the Catholic Church of the present day is not idolatrous in her faith or in her worship: — there is no alternative. Mr. Palmer may take which horn of the dilemma he chooses; but one or the other he must take. His ready learning will not here serve him; nor will it do again to prefer the refuted charge, that Dr. Wiseman had quoted from spurious works.

In conclusion, we would entreat Protestants, should these pages ever fall under the eye of any such, seriously to reflect for a moment on the sublime beauty of the Catholic doctrine concerning the honor and invocation of saints, and on the many signal advantages resulting from it to the Christian community.

To begin with the latter; how useful is it to keep continually before our eyes the virtues, the heroic struggles, and the glorious victories of the saints and martyrs of God! How the thought stimulates us to resist temptation, and to imitate examples so bright! And then how cheering to us, in our dreary earthly pilgrimage, to cast our eyes heavenward, and to catch a glimpse of that immortal glory which has already crowned the trials and sufferings of the saints; who were once pilgrims, like ourselves, encompassed with infirmity, but who are now shining, like the stars, in the glorious firmament of God! How the splendid vista encourages us to imitate their virtues on earth, that we may share their crowns in heaven! How powerfully and how eloquently it appeals to the noblest feelings of our nature! How strongly it attracts us to heaven! How it consoles us amidst all our tribulations! How many additional motives does it not give us "to praise God in his saints," and to love that heavenly Father, who, in crowning His servants, crowns only His own mercies! And, how strongly, and with what dramatic effect, does not the Catholic Church call forth all these noble feelings, by her perpetual round of festivals and anniversaries! Is there, in the cold and dreary land of Protestantism, any thing half so stimulating or ennobling, — any thing at all calculated to elicit such feelings, or to prompt to such noble emulation of saintly virtue? Protestantism has, alas! virtually abolished, if it has not wholly stricken from the Apostles' Creed, the beautiful article which professes to believe in the "communion of saints!"

The communion of saints! how sublime the idea it unfolds! How it annihilates time, annihilates distance, and causes the hearts of all the friends of Christ and favorites of heaven to beat in unision of hallowed feeling! How it reaches, like a golden chain, from earth to heaven, and binds both together in indissoluble love and unity! How it makes us, poor exiles on earth, already "fellow-citizens of the saints, and the domestics of God!"[1] How it makes the strong succor the weak, the rich succor the poor, those who abound in merits succor those who are needy, and those who are in glory succor those who are in tribulation!

---

[1] Ephesians, ii, 19.

How beautifully it carries out the scriptural ideas, that "God is love," that "love is the fulfillment of the law," and that "charity never faileth!" How it lifts us up from this dull earth, and binds us all together, by binding us strongly to God! How, in fine, it irradiates the earth with the smiles of heaven, — with those of the saints, of the angels, of the pure and spotless Mother of God, of God himself! "*Fingant quid tale hæretici!*—Let heretics produce any thing like this."[1]

Can there be aught of idolatry in a doctrine, which thus plainly elevates human nature, adorns and ennobles Christianity, gives us new and more expansive views of the divine goodness, and redounds to the honor and glory of God himself? Can there be idolatry in a doctrine, which thus plainly leads us to God, the bestower "of every good gift" whether in heaven or earth, and causes us to fall down reverently at the footstool of His heavenly throne? Can He be offended with the honors which we pay to his own servants and favorites, for His sake, and precisely because they are His servants and favorites? Will the Son be jealous of the honor paid to His blessed Mother, and paid to her only because she is His Mother? Can He who was obedient to her, and who refused her nothing on earth, refuse her any thing in heaven? Can He be unmindful of her sufferings on earth for the love of Him, and of the sword of grief which transpierced her soul on His account? No, no. The Catholic doctrine is as reasonable and scriptural, as it is ennobling and sublime.

We here dismiss Mr. Palmer for the present, reserving to ourselves the privilege of examining, on some future occasion, his objections to the Catholic doctrine of satisfaction, with its adjuncts — indulgences and purgatory.

---

[1] Tertullian.

XXIII. THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF SATISFACTION.*

FAITH AND WORKS.

Harmony of Catholic doctrines—Their scope and influence—The great Physician—His religion medicinal—The Doctrine of Satisfaction intimately connected with that of the Atonement—Standing at the foot of the cross—The center of the religious system—Source of light and heat—The Atonement sufficient—And made for all—Our co-operation necessary for its application to us—Denying ourselves, and entering into the sacrificial spirit of Christ—Scriptural proofs—Practice of the saints—Motive for corporal austerities—The cross ever-present to the Christian mind—The sacrifice of the altar and that of the cross—Protestant view of the Atonement—Faith and works—Halting half way—The more *comfortable* and the *safer* way—Caustic passage of Tertullian—Two roads to heaven—Palmer's view—His arguments superficial and captious—Temporal punishment for sin already forgiven—Scriptural examples—Palmer's explanation of them refuted—His paltry quibbling—Charge of absurdity answered—Reasons for the temporal penalty remaining—Palmer grows pathetic—Troubling the peace of consciences—Unearthly character of the doctrine—The blessings it has produced.

PERHAPS the most beautiful feature in the Catholic religion, and, at the same time, one of the most striking evidences of its divine origin, is the wonderful harmony which pervades its entire system of faith, worship, and morals. One doctrine naturally leads to another, and this again to a third; and the whole series of principles thus forms one unbroken chain of truth, which reaches from earth to heaven, and binds man strongly to his God. Remove but one link, and you break the connection, and destroy the integrity and usefulness of the chain itself. Add but one link to it, and you uselessly cumber its divine simplicity, and greatly diminish its heavenly beauty, if you do not even wholly mar its lofty purpose.

Whoever has studied well the philosophy of the Catholic system, and sounded its inmost depths, must have been forcibly struck by the intimate connection of its various parts, and the singular adaptation of the whole to the great purposes of the Christian religion: the purification and regeneration of fallen human nature, the restoration in the human soul of the partially defaced image of God, and the leading of man back to his Creator. To these sublime ends every thing in Catholicity directly tends. Its doctrines enlighten the understanding, dispelling its clouds, and unfolding to it both the origin and the remedy of sin. Its moral principles guide the will and control the emotions of the heart; while its sacraments are the divinely appointed channels of grace, through which flow, in a perennial stream, the abundant waters of life eternal, "for the healing of the nations." In this wonderful economy of grace, no want of humanity is left unprovided for, no ill is without its proper remedy.

---

*LETTERS TO N. WISEMAN, D. D., on the Errors of Romanism, &c. By the Rev. William Palmer, M. A., of Worcester College, Oxford. Baltimore: Joseph Robinson, 1843. Letters II, III, and IV. On the foundation of the doctrine of Satisfaction, Indulgences, &c. and on Satisfaction or Penances.

Man, created originally to the image and likeness of his God, and constituted in a state of innocence and sanctification, became, by his fall, a victim of cruel wounds and of deeply seated hereditary infirmities, both of soul and body. Christ came to restore him to the high estate from which he had fallen, and to heal his multiplied, aggravated, and inveterate spiritual maladies. For this purpose He established His religion, which was thus essentially *medicinal*, both in its character and in its object. It presented a balm for every disease, a panacea for every malady. The blessed Saviour accordingly represents himself as a heavenly physician, divinely sent to heal the sick: "They that are in health need not a physician, but they that are sick."[1]

The Catholic religion possesses, in a remarkable degree, these distinctive characteristics of primitive Christianity. All its institutions are eminently *healing* in their nature and influence. They are founded on so deep a knowledge of, human nature; they manifest so clear an insight into the hidden labyrinths of the human heart; they are so unearthly in their nature, so clearly supernatural in their means of action, so far remote from the senses, and so completely at war with the darling passions of fallen man: and, withal, they harmonize together so admirably in all their parts, that man could not, by possibility, have devised such a system; — it is clearly the work of God. In viewing the sublime character and the beautiful blending together of the various parts composing it, we are forced to exclaim with the royal psalmist: "The judgments of the Lord are true, *justified in themselves*.[2] This heavenly system flatters not the pride of man, it panders to no passion of corrupt human nature: — it declares war against all that is perverse, and bows down "every height that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God."[3]

A striking illustration of this divine harmony and admirable adaptation of the Catholic system to human needs, is presented in its DOCTRINE OF SATISFACTION. This doctrine, besides being the basis of many other Catholic tenets and observances, flows itself directly from the great and cardinal principle of the ATONEMENT. It is but a carrying out, an application, and a perpetual embodiment of this great mystery of redemption; it is but a constant preaching of "Christ and of Him crucified." It is the *spirit* of the great sacrifice of Calvary still lingering upon earth, in the bosom of Christ's cherished disciples; — a spirit, however, not inert or disembodied, but vigorous and displaying itself by constant external acts of heroic self-denial and mortification. The CROSS, the CROSS of Jesus! — How many saving truths, how many soul-stirring remembrances, how many thrilling associations, cluster around the cross!

To take an enlarged and adequate view of Christianity, we must stand at the foot of the cross, with the blessed Mother of the Crucified, and look abroad from the lofty eminence of Calvary. A new and brilliant prospect will then open before us, and a new light will burst upon our eyes. Then will we be able to view the Christian system in all its length and breadth, in all the wondrous harmony of its parts, and in all its divine adaptation to the wants of man.

---

[1] St. Matthew ix, 12.

[2] Psalms xviii, 10.

[3] Corinth. x, 5.

Then will we see and *feel*, that the atonement is truly the great center of the Christian system, even as the sun is the center of the universe; that all the other doctrines of Christianity revolve around this central point, even as the planets revolve around the sun; and that, as in the material, so also in the spiritual world, the sun of the system is the living source of light and heat and life. Blot the material sun from the heavens, and how dark and cheerless and lifeless this world of ours would become! All the laws of nature would be arrested in their course; the heavens would no longer send down their dews and rains, the brooks and rivers would cease to flow, vegetation would wither and die, animal life would become extinct, and nature would return to its original chaos. So also, strike out the atonement from the Christian system, and human nature would again become, what it was before the coming of Christ, a dreary, dark, and frightful waste: the dews and rains of divine mercy would cease to distil from the heavens, the streams of grace would be dried up, no fragrant flowers and no luscious fruits of virtue would adorn and enrich the garden of the soul, all spiritual life would be extinguished, and man would descend from his lofty pre-eminence to a level with the mere animal creation.

But with the blessed doctrine of the atonement, all is light, and warmth and life. Men no longer sit "in the region of the shadow of death," but they bask in the genial sunshine of heaven. Earth is no longer severed from heaven, but the two have become one; extremes have met; justice and mercy have embraced. By the saving influence of the atonement, man has been reconciled to his God, and "the hand-writing of the decree which was against him has been taken out of the way and fastened to the cross."[1] By the precious blood, which flowed from the wounds of Jesus Christ crucified, has salvation been purchased for all; and "through Him God has reconciled all things unto Himself, making peace through the blood of His cross, both as to the things that are on earth, and the things that are in heaven."[2] For we "have not been redeemed with corruptible gold and silver; . . . but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb unspotted and undefiled."[3]

The pages of the New Testament are filled with similar passages, all proving that the blood of Christ, shed on the cross, is the great and only source and fountain-head of redemption, and of the lights, graces, and aids by which salvation can be obtained. "Nor is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved."[4] No prayer will be heard which is not uttered in the name of the Crucified; no grace can be obtained which is not asked

[1] Colossians ii, 14. [2] Coloss. i, 20. [3] 1 Ep. S. Peter i, 18, 19. [4] Acts iv, 12.

for through the blood of the cross. Every grace which ever was, or ever will be bestowed upon mankind, from the date of the fall to the end of the world, was or will be bestowed solely in consequence of the blood of the cross, either to be shed or actually shed. There is nothing more certain than this: the whole scheme of salvation, whether in its germ under the old law, or in its full development under the new, rests upon this great cardinal truth. Thus the atonement operated both retrospectively and prospectively; and in point of time, as well as in vital importance, it is the great center of the spiritual world.

The atonement was amply *sufficient* for all the wants of fallen human nature. In the prophetic language of the psalmist, it contained "an abundant redemption."[1] It fully atoned not only for original sin, but also for all the actual sins of all mankind. Even one drop of the great Man-God's precious blood, would have superabundantly sufficed to expiate the sins of ten thousand worlds; because it was of infinite value and acceptance with God. The one great sacrifice of the cross "obtained an eternal redemption," and "exhausted the sins of many."[2] It fully paid the price of ransom for the sins of all the descendants of Adam. None were excepted from its influence; for "there is no exception of persons with God." All who had sinned in Adam, and had thereby incurred death, were ransomed in Christ.[3] The arms of the blessed Jesus extended on the cross embraced all mankind without exception: His heart loved all, and his heart's blood was bounteously poured out for all. And the system of belief, which would limit the atonement to a select few, is as unscriptural as it is narrow and unworthy of God.

By the atonement ample means were thus provided for the salvation of every child of Adam. Whoever therefore is not saved, perishes solely through his own fault. God has fully and superabundantly done His part, and He may still address to the world the plaint formerly uttered against the house of Israel: "What is there that I ought to do more to my vineyard that I have not done to it? Was it that I looked that it should bring forth grapes, and it hath brought forth wild grapes?"[4]

But man is *free*, either to use or to neglect these means of salvation; God offers no violence to his free will; he is still "placed in the hands of his counsel,"[5] and may choose either fire or water; — either the fire of the divine indignation, or the cooling streams of heavenly grace. God will compel none into heaven; He will bestow the crown of immortality only on those who have fought valiantly for it, and triumphed over sin through Jesus Christ.

As St. Augustine has somewhere remarked, God, who created us without our consent or aid, will not save us without our co-operation. The abundant merits of the redemption will be applied to us, only on condition that we, on our part, do all that God requires of us, as preliminaries to the application; He Himself freely aiding and assisting us by His holy grace, both in beginning and perfecting the good work. Of ourselves we can, indeed, do nothing towards our salvation; but without our free co-operation the grace of God will certainly not save us. Salvation is thus the result of two agencies combined: the weakness of man, strengthened and rendered efficient by the grace of God. The same inspired apostle who said, "We are not sufficient to think any thing of ourselves, as of ourselves,"[1] also said, "I can do *all things* in Him who strengtheneth me."[2]

---

[1] Psalm cxxix, 7.
[2] Hebrews ix, 12 and 28.
[3] See Romans, ch. v.
[4] Isaiah v, 4.
[5] Ecclesiasticus xv, 14.

With the blessed Saviour himself, the Catholic Church has ever taught, that the merits of the atonement are applied only to those who strive earnestly, with the grace of God, to imitate Christ, in His spirit, in His life, in His death. In the name of her divine Head and Spouse, she has ever addressed His words to all her children, as setting forth the essential conditions of discipleship: "If any man will come after Me, let him *deny himself, take up his cross and follow Me.*"[3] With the inspired Paul, she has ever taught that, to be sharers in the redemption, we must "be nailed to the cross with Christ; and live, now not we, but Christ in us."[4] She tells us that "they who are Christ's *have crucified their flesh,* with the vices and concupiscences."[5] She tells us daily that, like St. Paul, we must "chastise our bodies, and bring them into subjection,"[6] and must "*fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ in our flesh.*"[7] She tells us, that we must "*do penance in sackcloth and ashes,*"[8] as the Saviour said Tyre and Sidon would have done, had the works been performed in them that were done in Corozain and Bethsaida. She tells us, what John told the Jews on the banks of the Jordan: "Bring forth, therefore, *fruit worthy of penance;*"[9] and what Christ said, speaking of John: "The kingdom of heaven *suffereth violence and the violent bear it away.*"[10] She tells us, that those only are foreknown by God and predestinated to life eternal, who "*are made comformable to the image of His Son;*"[11] and that we must "*suffer* with Christ, if we would *reign* with Him."[12]

The whole New Testament abounds with such declarations, all going to show that we cannot expect to share in the merits of the redemption, unless we do violence to ourselves, deny ourselves, mortify our members, imitate the example of Christ, and catch His sacrificial and expiatory spirit. He was innocence itself, and yet was He made the victim of sin; we are guilty, we contributed to nail Him to the cross; — we *deserve* to suffer. "The disciple is not above the master;" and, as St. Bernard well remarks, "it is not becoming that, under a head crowned with thorns, the members should be over delicate." No, no. Those deceive themselves, to their own eternal ruin, who think that they may be saved while reclining on a bed of roses, when Jesus entered into His glory by lying on the hard bed of the cross. Those fatally deceive themselves, who think that they may reach heaven by treading the path of "primrose dalliance," while Jesus walked in a path bestrewed with thorns and marked by His own blood; and while He exclaimed: "How narrow is the gate, and straight is the way, which leadeth to life; and few there are who find it!"[1]

---

[1] 2 Corinth. iii, 4.
[2] Philippians iv, 13.
[3] St. Matth. xvi, 24.
[4] Gallatians, ii, 19, 20.
[5] Gallatians, v, 24.
[6] 1 Corinthians, ix, 27
[7] Collossians i, 24.
[8] St. Matth. xi, 21, and Luke x, 13.
[9] St. Matthew iii, 8.
[10] Id. xi, 12.
[11] Romans, viii, 29.
[12] 2 Timothy, ii, 12.

All the saints of God, from the days of St. John the Baptist down to the present time, — to say nothing of those who lived under the old law, — have acted on these principles, and have walked in this narrow and thorny path; and, in doing so, they did but imitate the great SAINT OF SAINTS, Jesus Christ himself, "the Author and Finisher of our faith." This doctrine it was, which peopled the deserts with holy men of God; who fled from the soft blandishments of the world and of the flesh, to crucify themselves in solitude. This doctrine it was, which raised up whole armies of virgins and of holy celibataries; who, denying themselves and "crucifying their flesh with its vices and concupiscences," preserved to the end of life the lily of purity, and now are privileged in heaven to be the special favorites of the Lamb, and "to follow Him whithersoever He goeth."[2] This doctrine it was, which made the martyrs smile on death, and even sigh for its approach; that their blood might be mingled with that of the great expiatory sacrifice, and that they might die for Christ and with Christ. This doctrine, in fine, was the basis of the severe penitential discipline, which generally obtained among the ancient Christians, and which, though mitigated in rigor, still exists in the Catholic Church of the present day.

Are we better than were the saints? Are we purer than was St. Paul? Can we expect to gain heaven by any easier way than that pressed and hallowed by the footsteps of ALL the special friends of God and of Christ, in all ages past? Have we fewer or less grievous sins to expiate than they had? Have we less need of penitential works? Have we less reason "to work out our salvation with fear and trembling,"[3] and "by good works to make sure our vocation and election?"[4] We deceive ourselves, if we think so. Had there been an easier way to heaven than that we have indicated above, Christ and His apostles would certainly have pointed it out to us, by word or example, or by both.

In voluntarily entering upon, and cheerfully pursuing the painful way of the cross, the saints sought, not only to be conformable to the *outward* example of Jesus Christ, but to enter into His *spirit*, and to offer themselves up as victims and holocausts of sin with Him. They presented "their members as instruments of *justice* to God;"[5] and they were ready to die with Christ in expiation of their own sins, and of those of their brethren. Their sufferings and penitential works, they knew and felt, had no intrinsic efficacy whatever — apart from the merits of Christ — towards obtaining the remission of sin or an increase of sanctity; but united with the sufferings, and hallowed by the spirit, of the Redeemer, they were rendered acceptable to heaven, and became powerful aids to salvation. The sacrifice of the disciple was acceptable, *only* when united with the sacrifice of the Master. The Father loved those only, who were conformable to the image of His well-beloved Son.

---

[1] St. Matth. vii, 14.
[2] Apocalypse xiv, 4.
[3] Philip. ii, 14.
[4] 2 Peter i. 10.
[5] Romans, vi, 13.

This spirit of sacrifice, springing thus from the great sacrifice of the cross, is the source of those austerities, voluntary macerations, penances, fasting, bodily inflictions, and other satisfactions, which have ever been dear to the fervent members of the Catholic Church. The cross thus pervades the whole Catholic system, and hallows its every observance. Sin nailed Jesus Christ to the cross; and the penance of a whole lifetime should not be deemed too much atonement for a single transgression. The Catholic is exhorted to preserve always an humble and penitential spirit, to be ever lowly in mind, and to tremble at the very shadow of sin, to cherish a constant spirit of compunction, and, in a word, to live and die with Christ on the cross. Penance is represented to him as the only safeguard of virtue, and the only sure means of salvation: "Unless you do penance, you shall all likewise perish."[1]

This holy compunction is daily nourished and strengthened by the great sacrifice of the new law; itself but a continuation and application of the one mediatorial sacrifice of Calvary. In the Mass, the same Victim of expiation, who freely bled on the cross for the sins of all mankind, is daily offered up, in an unbloody manner, on the altar; and thus "the death of the Lord *is shown forth*, until He come."[2] The cardinal idea of the sacrifice is thus kept fresh in the minds of the faithful; and the one great sacrifice of the cross is no longer a mere matter of history — a mere fact that is past — but it is continually reproduced, and made present again, as a living and breathing reality. Far from impairing the value and efficacy of the great sacrifice offered up on the cross, the clean oblation of our altars leads the mind back continually to that bloody expiation; and brings the Catholic daily and hourly to the summit of Calvary, where his devotion receives a new impulse, and his soul kindles with a new fervor. The sacrifice of the Mass is an exhaustless fountain of mercy, containing the living waters which spring up unto everlasting life; at which the devoted hero of the cross may be constantly refreshed, and be prepared to make new sacrifices for the love of Christ crucified. Those who can not see all this, have never studied the Catholic doctrine in its length, breadth, and depth.

Thus everything in the Catholic system is necessarily referred to the great doctrine of the atonement made once on the cross, as to its center and principle. This principle imparts health and vigor and life to all the doctrines and observances of Catholicity; and these, in their turn, recognize and set it off. The Christian life, as developed in the Catholic Church, is but an embodiment of the great atoning sacrifice,—of its spirit as well as of its outward form. The Catholic is told to keep his eye continually on Mount Calvary, where his loving Saviour was crucified:—

[1] Luke, xiii, 3.

[2] 1 Corinth. xi, 26

"To look, and make (his life) like the pattern that was shown him in the mount."[1] He is told that he cannot hope for the pardon of his sins, nor for everlasting life, unless he enter fully into the propitiatory and sacrificial spirit of Christ, and be prepared to be crucified with Him in atonement for sin; for that the merits of the atonement will be applied to him on no other condition. To be saved, he must have not only faith, but works.

Such is an imperfect outline of the doctrine of the atonement, considered as the basis of the Catholic Doctrine of Satisfaction. We think no impartial person can examine it thoroughly, without pronouncing it, not only conformable to Scripture, but, also, entirely consistent with itself, and an admirable carrying out of the great scheme of man's redemption.

The Protestant takes a different view altogether of the atonement. He agrees with the Catholic in admitting its entire sufficiency and efficacy, for the reconciliation of the sinner, and for the salvation of men; but he differs from the Catholic, in regard to the manner in which its efficacy and merits are to be *applied* to the soul. The starting point of the Protestant, is the great principle broached by Luther and his co-reformers—*that man is justified by faith* ALONE *without works.* The merits of the atonement "are apprehended by faith;" and if the sinner have only faith, he need fear nothing; he will be justified in this life, and saved in the next. Let him only believe firmly that Christ has died for him, and that his sins are pardoned by Christ; and, from a sinner, he suddenly becomes a saint! No works of penance or satisfaction are at all requisite; no fasting, no bodily inflictions, no mortification;—faith *alone* will suffice for everything. Christ has undergone all the suffering; we need suffer nothing: He has fully expiated our sins; nothing expiatory remains for us to do. Nay, it would be a derogation from the all-sufficient atonement of Christ, were we to deem any thing but mere faith at all necessary for our justification. In a word, according to this system, Christ has done *every thing* in the way of satisfaction; He has left nothing for us to do, except to believe!

Luther carried out this comfortable doctrine to its fullest extent; he even rejected good works as useless, if not positively sinful. With him, faith was every thing, works nothing. He even boldly corrupted the Word of God, in order to make it speak a language conformable to his favorite theory;[2] and he wholly rejected the Epistle of St. James, as "an epistle of straw, and unworthy an apostle," because it contains the following passages[3] clearly condemnatory of his error:—

> "What shall it profit, my brethren, if a man say he hath faith, but hath not works? Shall faith be able to save him?"
>
> "Even so faith, if it have not works, *is dead in itself.*"

---

[1] Exodus xxv, 40.

[2] In the text of St. Paul (Rom. iii, 28): "For we account a man justified by faith," &c., Luther added *alone;* and when challenged on the subject he answered: Sic volo, sic jubeo; stat pro ratione voluntas! So I will, so I command, let my will stand for a reason!"

[3] Ch. ii, vv, 14, 17, 19, 26.

"The devils also believe and tremble."

"For as the body without the spirit is dead, so also faith without works is dead," &c.

Modern Protestants, indeed, appear to have mitigated somewhat this original doctrine of the reformation; but they retain the doctrine itself, and it still exercises a powerful influence over their entire system. They still maintain that we are justified by faith alone; though most of them require works as a sequel to faith, or as the necessary fruits of justification. They all, however, concur in rejecting the obligation of works of penance and satisfaction; and in this they are but consistent with their great principle of justification by faith alone. Luther was certainly more consistent than they: for he did not halt half way, but boldly carried out the principle to its fullest extent; while they appear to exclude only the class of works which is most painful to human nature.

It must be admitted, that the Protestant is a very convenient and comfortable doctrine, which has made the path to heaven quite smooth and easy! If it be only *safe*, it is certainly a decided improvement on the good old Catholic method of mortification and penance. It has widened and smoothed the once narrow and rugged way of salvation; and a Christian may now go to heaven on a comfortable turnpike, if not on a rail-road. Verily, ours is an age of improvement! We have greatly improved on the example of St. Paul, of St. John the Baptist, and of Christ Himself! These, and all the saints of the olden time, led a hard and mortified life; but our modern preachers of the Gospel have changed all this!

We are doing our separated brethren no injustice. We are merely endeavoring to paint, in a forcible manner, the obvious tendency of their system, which many of them, we are happy to believe, do not fully carry out in practice. But is it not fashionable among Protestants to sneer at celibacy, at fasting, at penitential austerities, at corporal inflictions and macerations? Are not all these practices often represented, as a useless and foolish and even impious self-torment? Are not Catholics often likened to the Brahmin devotee of India, or to the fanatical worshipers of Juggernaut? Are not our saints ridiculed for having worn haircloths, used the discipline, practised chastity, renounced the world with all its dangerous blandishments, and retired into the wilderness, in imitation of Elias, of St. John the Baptist, and of Christ Himself?

Whence this caviling and bitterly sneering spirit, if not from the very principle to which we allude? What does Protestantism enjoin or recommend, that is particularly painful to the senses? Does it not constantly flatter the pride of the human mind, by setting forth the glorious privilege of private judgment, in opposition to the authority of the Church? Does it not place the married above the unmarried life, in direct opposition to St. Paul?[1] Does it often breathe a syllable about mental prayer, about entire abstraction from the world, about mortification of our carnal appetites, about love of solitude? Has it *one* institution embodying these lofty principles? Has it produced one saint, who reduced them to practice? If it has done any of these things, we apprehend the rest of the world has not known the fact.

---

[1] See 1 Corinth. ch. vii. Read the whole chapter.

In viewing the easy and comfortable doctrine of salvation, devised and practised by our dissentient brethren, we are forcibly reminded of a withering passage from the pen of Tertullian; who rebuked, with a biting sarcasm peculiarly his own, the softness of some among his cotemporaries, more than sixteen hundred years ago, in the following language:

> "Is it proper for us to supplicate for pardon of our sins, while clad in scarlet and purple? I allow you a brooch for adjusting your hair, powders for whitening your teeth, and an instrument of iron or brass for trimming your nails; I allow you to paint your lips and cheeks, that they may shine forth with fictitious lustre; I entreat you to seek out more refreshing baths, and to cool yourselves in more shady gardens or maritime retreats; add to your expenses, seek out the fattest ox and feast on its dainty flesh, drain old wine to the dregs;—and if any one ask you, why you bestow so many comforts on your soul? Tell him, I have sinned against God, and am in danger of perishing eternally!!"[1]

There are, then, two different ways to heaven: the one ancient, the other modern; the one strewn with thorns, the other with roses; the one offering us pardon and heaven, on condition of doing penance and practising good works in conjunction with faith, the other bidding us be of good cheer,—for that faith alone will save us. Which of these ways is the better and the *safer?* Which is more conformable to the passages of the inspired volume referred to above, and which more in accordance with the example set us by Jesus Christ, and by *all* the saints both of the old and of the new law? We think no one can be at a loss for an answer, and that every sensible man and sincere Christian would be disposed to respond, as Melancthon is said to have done to his dying mother, who asked his advice as to the religion she should then embrace: "The Protestant way is the more *convenient*, the Catholic is the SAFER."

We do not mean to imply, that all Catholics practise penitential austerities, and that all Protestants entirely neglect them. We are speaking of principles, not of men; of the nature and obvious tendency of the systems taught respectively by the Catholic and Protestant communions in regard to justification, not of the lives of those who profess to be governed by them. The Catholic may fall far short of his principles in daily practice, while the Protestant may go far beyond his:—and we have not a doubt that such is often the case in regard to both.

If we have dwelt thus long on general principles, it is because we deemed them of essential importance to the matter in hand;—a refutation of the specious quibbles of Mr. Palmer in regard to the Catholic Doctrine of Satisfaction.

---

[1] "Num ergo in Coccino et Tyriis pro delictis supplicare nos condecet? Cedo acum crinibus distinguendis, et pulverem dentibus elimandis, et bisulcum aliquid ferri vel æris unguibus repastinandis; siquid ficti nitoris, siquid coacti ruboris, in labia aut genas urgeat: præterea exquirito balneas lætiores, hortulani maritimive recessus; adjicito ad sumptum, conquirito altilium enormem saginam, defæcato senectutem vini; cum quis interrogarit, cur animæ largiaris, deliqui, dicito, in Deum, et periclitor in æternum perire." Tertullianus, Lib. de Pœnitentia.

He does not go back to first principles at all; and though he devotes three lengthy letters to an examination of the Catholic doctrine on this and other kindred points, yet he does not say any thing in relation to the real basis upon which these Catholic principles and practices rest. We deemed it absolutely necessary to supply this deficiency. The foundation of the Catholic Doctrine of Satisfaction, as well as that of the derivative or cognate doctrines of indulgences and purgatory, lies much deeper than the single principle which Mr. Palmer labors so strenuously to refute, viz: that after the *guilt* of mortal sin, and the *eternal* punishment due to it, have been remitted by God, there sometimes[1] or often remains a *temporal* punishment due to the divine justice; which temporal punishment will be exacted either in this life, or in the next in purgatory, unless it be remitted in view of the penitential works of the pardoned sinner, whether enjoined upon him or spontaneously undertaken, or of an indulgence granted by the Church in the name of Christ, or of both conjoined. This principle, indeed, is the immediate and proximate basis of the doctrine; but the cross of Jesus, and the obligation of imitating the example of Jesus crucified, and of entering into the spirit of His great atonement, constitute the more remote and deeper foundation of this and of all other Catholic doctrines. This, we trust, we have already shown, and Mr. Palmer has not even attempted to shake one of the great principles, we have above laid down and endeavored to demonstrate.

His attempt to disprove the principle just referred to, as the immediate basis of the doctrine of satisfaction, is one of the feeblest arguments we have ever chanced to read. It is as weak as it is pretending. It contains not one new idea, it presents not one new objection. A much stronger argument against the Catholic doctrine might have been produced, by merely translating Bellarmine's objections without his replies. An intelligent Scotch gentleman once informed us that this trick, on a larger scale, was actually tried some years ago in Edinburg; and that the translation of all Bellarmine's objections against Catholic doctrines, without his answers, was deemed the strongest book against "popery" which had ever appeared![2]

We venture the assertion, that there is not *one* objection against the doctrine of satisfaction in all the three Letters of Mr. Palmer, which had not been already alleged—and *better* alleged—and refuted too, by Bellarmine, nearly two hundred and fifty years ago! And we go even farther, and say that there is scarcely one of our most commonplace theologians who has not taken up and answered those identical arguments. So much for the learning and originality of Mr. Palmer, the boasted "no popery" champion of Oxford, the very impersonation of Anglican learning. Strip him of his borrowed plumage, and he would be bare indeed; take away his second-hand learning, and his works would become the mere shadow of their former selves. There is scarcely a tyro in Catholic theology, who could not make out a much stronger case against "popery," and refute it, too.

---

[1] The Catholic doctrine, strictly speaking, only requires us to believe that *a portion* at least of the temporal punishment due to sin *sometimes* remains after the sin itself has been remitted; though our theologians usually employ the term *often* or *generally* instead of *sometimes*. Si quis dixerit *totam* pœnam simul cum culpa remitti *semper* a Deo, satisfactionemque pœnitentium non esse aliam quam fidem, qua apprehendunt Christum pro eis satisfecisse; anathema sit. (Canon xii, Sessio xiv, Concil. Trid.) The wording, however, of the fifteenth canon seems to justify the manner of speaking adopted by Catholic divines.

[2] The work was entitled *Bellarminus Orthodoxus*.

We are confident that we are doing the Oxford divine no injustice. We have surveyed the whole ground he has gone over, and we speak advisedly on the subject. Our narrow limits will not allow us to take up and answer, one by one, the objections he offers against the Catholic principle, that a portion of *temporal* punishment sometimes or often remains due to the divine justice, after the guilt and the *eternal* punishment of grievous sin have been remitted by God. But his principal and most specious arguments may be ranged under three heads, which we propose briefly to state, and to answer in succession.

1. The first class of objections consists of an attempt to refute the scriptural arguments, alleged by our divines in support of the Catholic principle.[1]

The holy Scriptures abound with examples of a temporal punishment exacted by God, even from His most favored servants, *after* their sins had been already divinely declared to be forgiven. The whole human race is, in fact, a striking example of this feature in the divine economy. Sickness, all the ills of life, and death itself,—what are they but the wages of that fatal sin, by which our first parents disobeyed the command of God in the garden of paradise? And yet there seems to be no doubt that this first sin was pardoned, in view of the long and rigorous penance of our proto-parents. Thus a vast accumulation of *temporal* punishments has been for centuries, and is yet, exacted by God, for a sin pardoned thousands of years ago. And no matter how perfect or holy may be the descendant of Adam; no matter how thoroughly he may have been purified in the blood of the Lamb, yet is he still subject to sickness, to numberless infirmities, to death. So unbending is this law of the divine justice, that even the great SAINT of SAINTS, the immaculate Son of God, was not exempt from its influence, when He vouchsafed to clothe Himself with man's nature, and to become man's Sponsor to His Father! Jesus suffered, Jesus died, in the midst of agony unspeakable, in consequence of the fall of Adam, and of the accumulated guilt of his tainted descendants. And though He expiated the fault by His death on the cross, yet is the temporal penalty still sternly exacted *to this very day*, and it will be exacted to the end of time.

This one great leading fact would suffice of itself to establish the Catholic principle. How does Mr. Palmer answer this argument? He meets it with the paltry quibble, that these temporal punishments are the award of *original* and not of *actual* sin, and that, therefore, they prove nothing![2] But is not the principle clearly the same in regard to both species of sin?

---

[1] Letter ii, p. 14, seqq.

[2] Ibid. pp. 18, 19.

Does Mr. Palmer even attempt to show that there is no parallelism, so far as the present argument is concerned? He does not. He seems to think that assertion may be substituted for sound argument, in the warfare against Rome. Was not Adam's sin an *actual* sin? And was not he punished with temporal penalties, even after this actual sin had been pardoned? Mr. Palmer admits this;[1] but he very acutely observes, that God was under a promise to punish Adam temporally, and that "consequently (!) the punishment of Adam proves nothing!" O tempora! He really ought to write a book on logic! Does it weaken the argument, that the temporal punishment thus awarded to Adam and Eve, was extended to all their posterity to the end of time, Christ Himself not excepted?

But we have many special examples of this same principle, recorded on the pages of the inspired volume; in addition to the numerous scriptural passages alleged in the first part of this paper, which likewise clearly establish its truth.

Thus, Moses and Aaron distrusted the word of God at "the waters of contradiction," and though their sin was, no doubt, pardoned, yet did God sternly exact the heavy *temporal* penalty of their dying in sight of the promised land, without being allowed to enter it. And He assigned, as a reason for this punishment, the sin of incredulity they had committed at "the waters of contradiction;"[2] thereby clearly intimating that His *justice* required the penalty.

So, also, when the Israelites worshiped the golden calf in the wilderness, the wrath of God was enkindled against them, and He threatened to destroy them all; but at the prayer of Moses, "the Lord was appeased;" yet did His justice still exact a grievous *temporal* punishment, and "there were slain that day about three and twenty thousand men."[3]

Again, when the people of Israel murmured against God in the desert, His anger was on the point of consuming them all, but Moses earnestly interposed in their behalf, and the Lord said, "I have *forgiven* according to thy word;" yet He immediately added the stern claim of His *justice* to an awful *temporal* chastisement for their crime; "But yet all the men that have seen My majesty, and the signs that I have done in Egypt, and in the wilderness, and have tempted Me now ten times, and have not obeyed My voice, *shall not see the land* for which I swore to their fathers; . . . . in the wilderness shall your carcasses lie; your children shall wander in the wilderness forty years, ... until the carcasses of their fathers be consumed in the desert."[4]

Who more holy or favored of God than David, the man "after God's own heart?" David sinned grievously; he repented sincerely, and the inspired prophet, Nathan, declared to him, "The Lord hath also *taken away* thy sin;" and yet this same divine messenger immediately added: "Nevertheless, because thou hast given occasion to the enemies of God to blaspheme, *for this thing* the child that is born to thee shall surely die."[5]

---

[1] Ibid. p 19, note.

[2] Numbers xx, 12 and 24.

[3] Exodus xxxii, 10, 14, 28.

[4] Numbers xiv, 20, 22, 23, 32, 33.

[5] 2 Kings (or Samuel) xii, 9, 13, 14.

And this severe temporal punishment, as well as a long train of other afflictions, was rigorously exacted of the royal penitent, though his sin had already been pardoned. David bowed down under the scourging hand of God, and patiently submitted to the penalties which he knew and felt his sins deserved, though he had the positive assurance that they were already forgiven.

What clearer proofs of the Catholic doctrine could any one reasonably ask? Do not all these instances clearly establish the precise principle we are contending for? If not, we would wish to know, what evidence would be required to prove our position?

And how does Mr. Palmer answer all these facts and arguments? His answer is a simple repetition of what had been advanced and refuted a thousand times already! He gravely tells us, that there is no parallelism between the circumstances of the people of God under the old, and the people of God under the new law. He says:

> "A temporal penalty of some sort was necessary, when God *visibly* interfered in the affairs of men. But now that His guidance is entirely spiritual and invisible, temporal penalties are no longer necessary in the same way."[1]

This means, that under the old law such punishments were necessary for example and for warning to others, especially when the offender was a person of high standing and influence, and the offense was public and scandalous. But this is taking a very narrow and erroneous view of the subject; it is assigning, as the only motive of the divine conduct, a reason either not warranted by the facts at all, or plainly secondary and accidental to the real merits of the case. Whoever will examine the scriptural facts above alleged, must see that the temporal punishment was awarded for the *offense itself*, and with the clearly expressed intimation that the *justice* of God required its infliction; and all this after the sin itself had been pardoned. To say that it was awarded merely as a warning to others, or for the correction of the offender, is an assertion wholly gratuitous, and without a shadow of proof in the facts themselves. If we be permitted thus to explain away the plainest passages of Scripture, in order to make them bend to a preconceived theory, what certainty is there any longer in scriptural interpretation?

Mr. Palmer himself does not appear to rely much on this means of escaping from the difficulty; for we find him resorting to a new species of chicanery, in order to parry the force of the argument drawn from God's conduct towards the Israelites, related in chapter xiv, of Numbers, and in chapter xxxii, of Exodus, referred to above. He gravely assures us that when God declared to Moses, "I have pardoned (*forgiven* in the Catholic version), according to thy word," He did not imply the forgiveness of the *sin* committed, and the *justification* of those who had committed it, but merely "a remission of the immediate destruction by pestilence, and the disinheritance which God had threatened."[2] Likewise, when the sacred writer informs us that "God was appeased," the expression only means, that "He had commuted the sentence of utter destruction which He had pronounced against that people for their idolatry, into chastisements of a different character, at the prayer and intercession of Moses!"[1]

---

[1] Letter ii, p. 15.

[2] Ibid. pp. 16, 17.

We are willing to let these ingenious interpretations pass for what they are worth. They forcibly remind us of certain learned biblical exegesists in Germany, who have lately, by similar arts, frittered away the very substance of revelation; and we think Mr. Palmer might put in some claims to a connection with the school which they have founded. But we must hasten on to the second class of objections raised by him against the Catholic doctrine of satisfaction.

2. He enters into a course of what he, no doubt, deemed stringent reasoning, to prove that the Catholic doctrine is absurd, inconsistent with itself, and subversive of man's salvation.[2] He cannot conceive how God can remit the sin itself, and the eternal punishment due to it, and still reserve to Himself the right of exacting a temporal penalty from the hands of the pardoned sinner. *He* cannot understand it, therefore it is absurd! *He* cannot fathom the counsels of God, therefore they are wholly unfathomable, if not absurd! This is reasoning backwards. It is precisely the process adopted by the Socinian to impugn the Trinity, and by the deist to disprove revelation.

Will Mr. Palmer explain how God could still leave *him* subject to disease, to concupiscence, and to death, notwithstanding the full pardon of all his sins, and of all the eternal punishments due to them,—which we trust has been extended to him,—and notwithstanding that the sin of Adam and Eve, which provoked all those temporal penalties, was also long since remitted by God? If he will explain this, and all the other facts of a precisely similar character alleged above, then may we undertake to explain to him how God may still reserve a temporal penalty, after the pardon of sin. The ways of God are not to be judged by our imperfect and low human standard; they are to be appreciated by the facts and principles, which He has vouchsafed to reveal to us. And if there be any certainty in the Scriptures, the principle of divine action contended for by Catholics is, as we have seen, therein clearly set forth.

Mr. Palmer winds up his reasoning under this head, with the following remarkable passage:

> "So that, according to your doctrine, the justified and pardoned believer is still subject to God's wrath! The adopted, beloved, and sanctified child is still subject to God's vengeance! God loves and hates, saves and destroys, at the same moment; and the same beings are at once reckoned with the elect and the reprobate, with angels and with devils! Can it be possible for absurdity, contradiction, and impiety to go beyond this! And yet this is the necessary, the inevitable consequence to which your doctrine leads."[3]

Nonsense! The Catholic doctrine teaches no such absurdities, and leads to no such consequences; they exist only in Mr. Palmer's heated brain. Those whose sins God has forgiven, are not any longer, according to the Catholic doctrine, reckoned with "reprobates and devils;" they are not "hated or destroyed" by God. The justice of God may, indeed, still have some comparatively slight claims on them for past transgressions not yet fully atoned for, but He loves them, and has already washed them in the blood of His well-beloved Son. If He chastise them still, it is as a most tender parent chastises a well-beloved child. His apostle tells us, "whom the Lord loveth He chastiseth, and He scourgeth every son whom He receiveth."[1] Does this prove that His favorite children are, at the same time, "loved and hated, saved and destroyed?" In short, Mr. Palmer's argument applies, with equal force, to all the scriptural facts on the subject which we have already furnished: and if there be any absurdity in the case, he has to settle the difficulty with the inspired record of revelation itself.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Letter ii, pp. 21, et seqq.

[3] Ibid. p. 22.

Though we can not pretend to fathom the counsels of God, and though it is not at all necessary to inquire into any thing farther than the *facts*, when it is question of divine agency, yet may we assign some plausible reasons, based on revelation, for the occasional or frequent reservation of a temporal penalty after the pardon of the sin itself. God's mercies are, indeed, above all His works, and the atonement of Christ is superabundant; but is it proper that a grievous sinner, who has long outraged God by his iniquities, and long trampled on the blood of the Lamb, by which he was once washed from all defilement in baptism, should be *immediately* reinstated, not only in the divine favor, but also in all the privileges of a cherished child of God?[2] Should he not be required to do something to indicate the depth of his sorrow, and to atone somewhat, by and through the merits of Jesus Christ, for his former iniquities? Should he not chastise his body with St. Paul, crucify his flesh, make his members instruments of divine justice, as he had prostituted them to sin?[3] Should he not do as much for God, as he had done against God, and punish himself at least as much as he had unlawfully gratified his flesh?

There is a voice in the human bosom, which proclaims the fitness and the justice of this course; and he who thinks he shall escape "the wrath to come," without "bringing forth fruit worthy of penance," deceives himself fatally. Does not the wise man tell us: "Be not without fear about sin forgiven?"[4] How can the sinner expect to share in the atonement of Christ, without entering into the atoning spirit of Christ, and without being willing to suffer and to die with Christ? He was innocent, the sinner is guilty; shall the innocent suffer all, and the guilty nothing? No! cold and dreary Protestantism! Thou pratest much about the atonement, and thou sneerest bitterly at others, but thou understandest not what the atonement is! Thou hast not one particle of the noble heroism inspired by the atonement!

---

[1] Hebrews xii, 6.

[2] See St. Paul's testimony, Hebrews vi, 4 seq.—an obscure, but terrible passage.

[3] See Romans vi.

[4] Ecclesiasticus v, 5.

There have been, and there are still, no doubt, many instances in which God has remitted, or remits the whole temporal punishment along with the guilt of sin: moved thereto by His own abounding mercy, and by the superior fervor of the penitent. The prodigal son, the thief on the cross, Magdalene, and others are instances of this kind. But can all expect a like favor? As well might all the sick among Christians claim to be suddenly healed, as were those in the time of our Saviour; and all the dead, to be suddenly resuscitated, like Lazarus!

In the curative process, after the malady has been entirely healed, the effects of it are often sensibly felt during a longer or shorter convalescence; so also, in the process of spiritual healing, there may often remain some effects or remnants of the disease, after the malady itself has been removed by forgiveness. The same Lord is the God of nature as well as of grace, and he frequently adopts similar modes of procedure in both. We do not, however, allege this as a reason or argument, but merely as an illustration.

3. We have room for but a word or two in relation to the third class of objections, raised by Mr. Palmer against the Catholic doctrine of satisfaction. He opines that it should be rejected, because it tends to trouble our peace of conscience, and to torment us with doubt and perplexity! Here are his words:

> "And when is this fear to be removed? When is the sinner to be at peace with God? When is he to look with joy and love to God as a reconciled and loving Father? NEVER IN THIS LIFE. . . . And is this the *peace* and *consolation* which you offer to burdened consciences? Are these the blessings which are to flow on those who go to you to heal their wounds, and sooth their afflictions?" &c.[1]

Well, this is all pathetic enough. Much do we regret, if it were only for Mr. Palmer's sake, that the way to heaven is not wider and smoother than Christ declared it to be, both by word and example. This doctrine of satisfaction is surely not agreeable to flesh and blood; but we are told that "flesh and blood can not possess the kingdom of God."[2] We would humbly suggest, that it is barely possible to "offer *too much* peace and consolation to burdened consciences;" and that there are those who say "peace, when there is no peace." Is it not more likely that an humble and fervent Christian, who strives to imitate Christ in his sufferings, and to become with Him a victim of sin, will enjoy a real and solid peace and consolation, than the one who is willing to suffer nothing for his sins, or, at least, nothing more than he can possibly help? The yoke of Christ is indeed sweet, and His burden light; but it is still a *yoke* and a *burden*, and the yoke is sweet and the burden light, only to those who bear them willingly and with love, for the sake of Christ, and in union with Christ. His grace sweetens and lightens, what would otherwise be bitter and intolerably burdensome.

In defending and reducing to practice the doctrine of satisfaction, the Catholic Church proves herself to be the true spouse of Christ, deeply sympathising with Him in His sufferings, and entering into the spirit of His great atonement. "Flesh and blood hath not revealed this doctrine to her, but the Father who is in heaven."[1] It is plainly unearthly, and of heavenly origin; man could not possibly have devised it; it is clearly from God.

---

[1] Letter iii, p. 8

[2] 1 Cor. xv, 50.

With how many blessings has not this doctrine strewn the earth! How many splendid temples, how many magnificent hospitals for the sick, how many asylums for the afflicted of every class, has it not erected! Visit the noble institutions of the middle ages, still existing all over Europe; ask the history of their foundation; and some old record will inform you that they were reared, in many cases, by opulent penitents—*ad expianda peccata,*—for the expiation of sins committed in their past life![2] Let innovators produce monuments like these!

---

[1] Matth. xvi, 17.

[2] See "Ages of Faith," by Digby, vol. ii.

XXIV. THE CONFESSIONAL.*

TACTICS OF ITS ENEMIES.

Strong presumptive evidence of Catholicity—The proud position of the Church—Phases of the warfare against her—Appeal to passion against truth—Luther's tactics—Those of other reformers similar—Protestant and infidel arguments against Catholicity compared—The vilest of all the modes of attack—Closing the Church against ladies—Books teeming with obscenity—A burning shame for Christian ministers—Sympathy with infidels—Who was Michelet?—An amusing incident—Translator of Michelet—A horrid picture of woman—Mohamedanism revived—Methodist Camp-meeting—A "female Jesuit"—"Incarnation of Satan"—Transcendentalism—A rare consolation!—"French bulls"—Inconsistency and contradiction—Michelet as an historian and logician—His premises false—And his reasoning illogical—Blindness of bigotry—The serpent in paradise—A portrait—"The end justifies the means"—Great honor to the Church—The beams and the mote—The confessional considered by the light of experience—A palpable absurdity—A gross libel upon the sex—Course adopted by the Protestant preachers—Extracts from our theologians—Parallel cases—"Whipping hypocrisy"—Whence all the clamor against the Confessional?"—Did the priests introduce it?—What motive could they have had?—Was it possible to make the change—The question of innovation tested—History appealed to—Prescription—Our Saviour and the Pharisees.

ONE of the strongest and most striking evidences of Catholicity is found in the fact, that its enemies cannot attack it with any plausibility or semblance of success, without grievously misrepresenting its doctrines, and appealing against them to the worst passions of the human bosom.

The Catholic religion always maintains her lofty position, as the handmaid of heaven, and the divinely constituted witness of the truth: she flatters not the passions of men, in order to win their homage; she would not compromise one particle of the truth committed to her in deposit, though by the sacrifice she should gain the whole world; she is prepared to fulfill her high mission for the glory of God and the salvation of men, though she should, in the discharge thereof, be nailed to the cross with her divine Founder and Spouse. She changes not, though all else is changing around her. Her institutions may displease the world, and become unfashionable; still she fondly clings to them; she will not suffer one of them to be impaired or destroyed: her mission is not to please, but to save men. She will not "stoop to conquer," will not descend into the arena of the world, will not wield the weapons of carnal warfare, will not enter into alliance with flesh and blood. She will not stain the laurels of victory, won during eighteen centuries of glorious strife with the world, the flesh, and the devil, by any such unhallowed means: and hence it is that the world hates her. It hated her divine Founder before her, and for the self-same reason.

---

* "*Du Pretre, de la Femme, de la Famille.*"

Spiritual Direction, and Auricular Confession; their History, Theory, and Consequences: being a translation of "Du Pretre, de la Femme, de la Famille." By M. Michelet, Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Letters, &c. Philadelphia: James M. Campbell. 1845. Pp. 224, 12mo.

She will not, because she can not, change; and her adversaries cry out that she is not adapted to the spirit of the age, which is eminently a spirit of progress and of change in every thing,—from simple machinery up to the higher departments of philosophy and religion. She proclaims to the world, as the revelation of God, many doctrines unfathomable to reason and humbling to human pride; and the world cries out, absurdity and nonsense! She enforces the divine obligation of many things painful to human nature; and men cry out that she is the enslaver of the world, and that her principles are incompatible with human liberty. Still she heeds not all this clamor, but firmly, yet mildly, pursues her divine pilgrimage of mercy and charity, without turning either to the right or to the left, to please men.

It has ever been so. The tactics of the evil one, in his assaults against the truth, have not varied in the lapse of long centuries. From the time that he dared tempt Jesus Christ Himself in the wilderness, down to the very latest campaign he has made against His Church, the spirit of his warfare, as well as its chief appliances, has not changed. He tempted Christ by an impious and most unblushing appeal to the human passions of sense, of avarice, and of pride; and he tempts the disciples of Christ by the self-same weapons of the flesh. To the disciples as to the Master, he says: "All these things will I give you, if, falling down, you will adore me;" but the disciples answer, as did the Master: "Begone, Satan; for it is written, the Lord thy God thou shalt adore, and Him only shalt thou serve."[1]

We might easily illustrate all this, by a reference to the different phases of the warfare against Catholicity in ages past. We might prove that, how different soever were the favorite modes of attack at different periods, they all, nevertheless, possessed this trait in common;—they appealed to passion against truth. The older heretics did this; the modern dissenters still do the same. The ancient heretics succeeded partially and for a time; they seduced many from the truth by their maddening appeal to a corrupt nature: but they finally disappeared from the arena, together with their victims; and the truth still stood forth triumphant, waving its unsullied banner of victory over a conquered world. The modern innovators have but renewed the same phases of unhallowed warfare,—of apparent victory, and of final but certain and overwhelming defeat. It has ever been so; it must ever be so. He who could not deceive, had foretold that the world should hate His disciples, but that the gates of hell SHOULD NOT PREVAIL AGAINST HIS CHURCH, BUILT UPON A ROCK.

At the dawn of the reformation, Luther appealed to the political feelings and prejudices of the Germans against the primacy of the Pope. He stirred up the slumbering embers of old feuds between the Popes and the emperors, blew on them with the warm breath of his indignant invective, and enkindled a fire in the bosom of Germany, which threatened to destroy the venerable edifice of Catholicity. He cried out at the top of his stentorian lungs, that the Germans had been groaning for centuries in the bondage of a worse than Babylonian captivity, and that the day of their emancipation was at hand. Those whom he could not lure to his standard by the impassioned cry of LIBERTY, he wooed by the softer, but yet more insinuating appeals which he made to their avarice or to their sensuality. To the princes he offered, as a bait, the plunder of the immense church property, accumulated during ages of faith and piety; to bishops, priests, and monks he held out the additional inducements of a handsome wife and a comfortable establishment; to all he offered freedom from many painful restraints on the passions, imposed by the ancient religion. Fasting, daily prayer, singing or reciting the divine office, celibacy, penance and mortification, were to be done away with; and Christians were henceforth to get to heaven by treading the primrose path of dalliance with human nature, with the light of only one single principle, — that of faith *alone*, — beaming upon them for their guidance. The painful restraint of Church authority was to be discarded, and each one was to live as he listed, with his Bible for his guide, and his own private judgment as the only key to its meaning. With the employment of such means, no wonder that he gained proselytes; but the whole scheme was manifestly a downhill reformation.

---

[1] St. Matthew iv, 9, 10.

The very same system of tactics was adopted at Geneva, in northern Europe, in Switzerland, in France, and in England; and with precisely the same results. Everywhere the same maddening appeal was made to the worst passions of the multitude; every where people were lured to the standard of revolt against the Church by carnal arguments, eloquently stimulating flesh and blood to war against the Pope. All this is strikingly true of England. The bluff old tyrant, Henry VIII., broke with the Pope, that he might secure a young wife in lieu of a most virtuous one, stricken in years, of whom he had grown tired; he brought his people over to his cause by a series of acts of high-handed tyranny which would have disgraced a Nero, and by a course of sacrilegious spoliation of altars and churches which would have disgraced Antiochus and Nebuchadonosor. But the master stroke of his policy, and of that of his successors, was the adroit and persevering appeal constantly made to the passions of the multitude. Open English history for the last three hundred years, and you will read evidences of this truth on almost every one of its sullied pages.

The self-same spirit pervades that phase of the warfare against Catholicity, which consists in holding up its dogmas to execration as absurd and opposed to human reason, and its worship as a senseless mummery. The mystery of the adorable Eucharist cannot be comprehended, therefore it is absurd; the sacrifice of the Mass, based thereon, cannot be comprehended, therefore it is idolatrous; the ceremonies of Catholic worship cannot be understood or appreciated, therefore they are downright mummery! With what other weapons does the Unitarian attack the mysteries of the incarnation, the atonement, and the trinity? And with what other does the deist assail all mysteries and all supernatural revelation? Do not the opponents of Catholicity, like the opponents of Christianity, stand forth self-condemned of "blaspheming whatsoever things they know not?"[1] Are they not convicted, by their mad course of opposition to Catholicity, of an implied consent to the destruction of Christianity itself? Do they not, like the infidels, "despise dominion, and blaspheme majesty?"[2] Let them look to it, and to the awful denunciation pronounced by the inspired Jude against those who do these things.

But by far the most vile mode of attack, which was ever adopted by the enemies of Catholicity, consists in an unblushing appeal to that low animal passion, unfortunately inherent in our nature, which leads to crimes that St. Paul would not have to be even so much as named among Christians. This may be pronounced the latest, it is certainly the most disgraceful, phase in the warfare against Rome. Reverend "no-popery" champions, boasted ministers of the God of holiness and purity, make no scruple whatever of treating with the most disgusting detail, both in the pulpit and through the press, certain matters which a pure-minded Christian should blush even to think about. Such Reverend ministers as the Sparries, the Brownlèes, and the Breckenridges, think nothing of giving circulation to obscene matter, which would cover with disgrace the most ordinary citizen, who lays no claim to any peculiar sanctity, but simply stands forth clad in the panoply of an honest and a *decent* man. They even sometimes go so far, in their mad zeal against Rome, as to desecrate the temple of God itself with obscenity, by preaching therein sermons not fit for ears polite, and with doors accordingly closed against *the ladies!* What is not fit for ladies' ears, is fit for preachers of the gospel, and quite good enough for the temple of the living God!

How blind is bigotry! How odious and detestable is hypocrisy! Can we wonder that our beloved country is so much overspread with immorality and infidelity, when such men as these pass as the accredited ministers of God's word, and the organs and leaders of His people? When they continue to do their dirty work, with scarcely a rebuke from the representatives of popular sentiment? The inspired apostle draws a graphic portrait of such men, when he characterizes them as "raging waves of the sea, *foaming out their own confusion,* wandering stars; to whom the storm of darkness is reserved forever;" and, when he points the finger of withering denunciation at them, and says, "these are they WHO SEPARATE THEMSELVES, sensual men, having not the spirit."[3]

Nothing can be too bad for these men, provided it be only directed against the Catholic Church. Their morbid appetite for scandal rejects no food, no matter how loathsome. The most obscene narrative of the most obscene and abandoned wretch, like Maria Monk, or of the most drivelling apostate, like Smith, Hogan, Giustiniani, and Ciocci, is precisely what most pleases their palate. They stop not to inquire what is the character of the writer or narrator, or what are his or her claims to be received as an accredited witness; provided the story militate against the Pope and the Catholic religion, it is enough. The book is published and circulated with zeal; it is bought up and read with avidity by a certain class of the people stricken with the "no-popery" mania; and it has already done its deadly work, before its refutation can be made public. The refutation, did we say? The refutation cannot generally be made *public;* that is, it cannot reach those who have been infected with the poison; the preachers and their agents will see to that; they are so fond of *not* keeping their people in ignorance, that they and their organs seldom, if ever, publish the refutation, how triumphant soever it may be! Their followers are thus allowed to read only on one side; poisonous error and calumny have already sped with the velocity of lightning to the remotest ends of the union, on the wings of an untiring press; and when the truth comes "slowly limping after it," these ministers of *truth* take special care to check or prevent its progress! How many, think you, of those hundreds of thousands who swallowed with avidity the poison of Maria Monk's obscene impostures,—known by all to be impostures,—were allowed to receive the antidote? How many, think you, of the Protestant *religious* press published a contradiction of that wicked book? And what vast multitudes are there not even now of the ignorant haters of the Pope,—of pious old ladies of both sexes,—who still devoutly believe every syllable written in that infamous book? Of course, these people are never priest-ridden!

---

[1] St. Jude, v. 10. [2] Ib. v. 8. [3] St. Jude, vv. 18, 19.

We speak advisedly, and we know what we say. Is it not a burning shame that such things should be done in a Christian land, in the light of the nineteenth century, and by Christian ministers? And, when this course is still persisted in, in spite of all our just denunciation of its unchristian spirit and glaring injustice; when, as fast as one book of obscene horrors can be disposed of, the teeming press is in labor with another; when many heads start into existence, in place of the one which we have stricken off from this hydra of an impure bigotry; and when even Reverend preachers are the active instruments in causing all this mischief, and in pouring over this virgin hemisphere all this foul torrent of impurity, could we, we ask, have employed softer language in rebuking a spirit so unclean? We know that in doing so, we have with us the most enlightened and pure-minded of the Protestant community itself; and we feel convinced that this disgraceful method of warfare has already recoiled, and will still recoil, with terrible effect, on the heads of those same mountebanks, who are now the active leaders of the crusade against Catholicity in this country. The American people will not consent to be forever duped; there is a point beyond which even their forbearance will not go. The reaction must come, and the retribution it will bring with it, will be a fearful one for those who now seem to bask in popular favor.

We have been led into this train of reflection by perusing the work of Michelet, the title of which is given above. A more thoroughly wicked or a worse publication we have never chanced to read; and we verily believe that if Satan himself could appear upon earth, clad in bodily form, armed with the appliances of pen, ink, and paper, he could not have written a worse book; though he certainly would have composed one marked with much more ability, — blended with at least equal hatred of Rome and Catholicity. He would not have blundered nor ranted half so much, but he would have written a more logical and a more effective work; and our word for it, the Reverend leaders of the anti-catholic crusade in this country would have republished it, duly translated, if necessary, into English; after such a fashion, too, as to make it lose nothing of its malignity by the translation! When they are ready to fraternize with such unblushing infidels as Michelet, is it too much to believe that they would extend the right hand of fellowship to the evil one himself, were he *visibly* to step forth as a knighted "no-popery" champion? We think not, and we believe that our readers will agree with us, when we shall have told them who this Michelet is, and what is the character of his book.

Who, then, is Michelet? He is a French transcendentalist, a pantheist, and a downright infidel; a man who is even at no pains to conceal his infidelity. He is a disciple of Voltaire and Rousseau; with the bitterly scoffing spirit of both, but without the talent of either. He has somewhat of the impetuosity, the incoherency, and the extravagance of Rousseau; but he has little of his impetuous eloquence: while he has not a particle of the genius or of the polished and effective satire of that incarnation of demonism — Voltaire. He hates religion with a satanical hatred; his hatred is blind, mad; but there is little method in his madness. He strikes about him with the malignity of a serpent, but also with its blindness. When he writes against the Catholic religion, he means to write against Christianity; when he pours out his venom against *priests*, he means the ministers of all denominations.

He writes against priests, just as Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and Tom Paine wrote against them. And when the translator coolly undertakes to tell us that he meant only "French priests,"[1] and that he attacked only the Catholic religion as taught and practised in France, he takes a very narrow and most erroneous view of the scope contemplated by his author. He falls into about the same delusion into which some very cordial haters of the papacy fell, a few years ago, in the West.

The incident we allude to is both amusing and characteristic. Some years ago, a paper was announced as about to be published in New York under the captious title, "Priestcraft Unmasked." A number of elders of the Presbyterian church and other Protestants of our acquaintance, thinking from its title that it would be a first rate "no-popery" paper, subscribed for it with avidity, and paid their subscription in advance.

---

[1] In his preface, which is a curious specimen of disingenuous special pleading.

But what was their surprise and chagrin on finding that the paper turned out to be a downright infidel concern, gotten up in the true Tom Paine style, and intended chiefly to unmask Presbyterian "priestcraft!" They found out their error when it was too late to remedy it; and their acquaintances laughed heartily at their expense.

We know not who the translator of Michelet is, nor do we much care; though he should not have been ashamed to append his name, that the world might know to whom we are indebted for the appearance amongst us of this charming work in an English dress. He does not, at any rate, appear to have been much conversant with the French, and he was often sadly puzzled to get at the meaning of his author, as we may have occasion to show in the sequel. But whoever he may be, if he be a Christian at all, he should blush to have aided in palming such a work on a Christian community. He must have known and *felt* that Michelet was an infidel, whose work could do nothing but harm. That he had, at least, some misgivings on the subject, appears from his preface, in which he is compelled to give us, what we take to be an apology for the French infidels:

> "The book written by a Frenchman, for Frenchmen, in language and thought is most thoroughly and remarkably *French*. The reader may be startled at the freedom with which the author approaches subjects and themes which we are accustomed to speak of only with the deepest reverence. We do not doubt *his* reverence; but the strange forms of expression which he uses to express equally strange turns of thought, sometimes grate more than a little harshly on our ears. The reader is to bear the history of the book in mind at all times, and nearly upon every page."

A little farther on, speaking of the French infidels, he thus shows his sympathy for them:

> "Their minds revolted at the character of priestly traditions, the empty quibbles with which priests smothered the truth, the sophistry with which they belied it, and the carnal affections which led to their materialism. In a word, *the brilliant French infidels could not be idolaters*. In discarding what was manifestly monstrous, they threw all away; *and even this was not done entirely of their own impulse*. They retreated but a little way at first; *they were driven to extremes by anathemas*. . . . . If we see, then, an *occasional indifference to Christianity* in Michelet, we know to what to impute it,"[1] &c.

Again, who is Michelet? A man who is forever prating about the dignity of human nature, yet understands not in what its true dignity consists; a man who would fain persuade others that our nature is sound and amply competent of itself for its own guidance, and yet, when it suits his purpose, paints man as a beast and woman as a demon! His theory would seem to be, that, without religion, man and woman can live uprightly and properly, and become the ornament and support of the family and of society; but that, with religion, the very fountains of their otherwise stainless nature are polluted, and they become pestilent members of the social circle, and totally unfit to sustain the family relation! With all his cant about the elevation and progress of man, he really places a lower estimate upon the nature of man and of woman, than the disciple of Mohammed himself. It will not do to say, that he confines his view to *Frenchmen* and *French women*, as the translator would seek to persuade his readers;[1] he speaks of man and of woman in general. It might have been, perhaps, a better explanation of his theory in regard to human nature, to have said that he judged of others by himself. What are we to think, for instance, of his portrait of woman, in the following passage?

---

[1] Preface, pp. 5, 6. In his History of France, b. i, ch 8. and b. iv, ch. 4, Michelet makes a hero of Pelagius, the heresiarch of the fifth century, and what, think you, is the chief title of Pelagius to our author's praise? Hear him: "Pelagius, by denying original sin, RENDERED REDEMPTION USELESS, and ANNULLED CHRISTIANITY!"

> "Woman, the part of the world eminently worldly, surrenders her family and her fire-side — her most precious possessions. Eve still betrays Adam; the woman betrays man, her husband, her son! Thus each sells her deity. Rome sells Christianity, woman her domestic religion.
>
> "The feeble souls of women, *incurably spoiled* by the great corruption of the sixteenth century (!), *full of passions and of fear, and of bad desires crossed by remorse*, eagerly seized this means of sinning with a quiet conscience, and of expiation without amendment, amelioration, or return towards God. They were happy to receive at the confessional a political order, or the direction of an intrigue as works of penance. They carried into this singular mode of expiation the same guilty passions which they were laboring to expiate, and to atone for remaining in sin, were often guilty of crime. The female mind, inconstant in all things else, was in this sustained by the manly firmness of the mysterious hand concealed behind her."[2]

He seems to be fully impressed with the thoroughly Mohammedan notion, that man and woman cannot be brought together, even in the holiest relation, whether of society or of religion, without being carried away by sinful thoughts. His principal reasoning — if reasoning it may be called — against the confessional, is based upon this corrupt view. It pervades his entire work, and upon almost every page manifests itself in passages, which it may suit the purposes of our Reverend slanderers to reproduce, and to spread out before the community for the perusal of the young and innocent, but which are much too gross for our pages. Upon those whose minds and hearts are already thoroughly rotten, like his own, such impassioned tirades may produce a strong and dangerous impression; the pure-minded will turn from their perusal with disgust unutterable.

---

[1] Preface.

[2] Pages 41–2. In another passage, Michelet pretty clearly advocates the execrable doctrine of universal concubinage! He defends it on the ground, that matrimony imposes a slavish restraint on the freedom of love! He does not, indeed, come out openly, but his principles seem to lead this way. He says that the only generous and proper love is, "to love in *liberty, free to love or not.*" (P. 200.) He adds, that the lover should furnish the beloved with "arms even against himself. This is love, and this is faith. It is the belief that, *sooner or later*, the EMANCIPATED being must return to the most worthy." (P. 201.) That is, according to this beautiful theory, love should be wholly untrammeled, and should be bestowed, and will be bestowed, whenever the unfortunate victim of it shall be *emancipated*, on the most worthy; that is, according to Michelet, "on him who would be *freely loved*." (Ibid.) Have not the preachers consulted well for the morality of the country, when they gave circulation to this infamous book?

What loathing, for instance, is not produced in the upright soul by reading the following passage, in which he illustrates the "excitement" awakened in the confessional, by the following flattering allusion to religious meetings in our own country!

"And why should not this excitement happen in such an interview? *It is enough for persons of different sexes to pray together in the same room, to induce intoxication and burn the brain.* This happens in the assemblies of excited Protestants in the United States and elsewhere. Read the witty and judicious trifle of Swift's 'Fragment on the Mechanical Operations of the Spirit,' especially towards the close of it."[1]

And yet this man, forsooth, meant to speak only of *French* women, of *French* priests, and of the Catholic religion in France! Similar in spirit is the following passage, which still farther illustrates his theory of human nature:

"The confessor of a young woman can boldly define himself to be envious of the husband, and his secret enemy. If there is one who is an exception to this (and I wish I could believe it), *he is a hero, a saint, a martyr, a man above a man.*"[2]

The following elegant extract proves that what we have said above, concerning the low estimate he places on woman, is not at all exaggerated:

"There is a great difference between the hardness of a man and the cruelty of a woman. What is, in your opinion, the most faithful incarnation of the devil in this world? This inquisitor, or that Jesuit? No; it is a female Jesuit; a great lady converted, who believes herself born to rule; who, among this flock of trembling females (in a convent), assumes the part of a Bonaparte, and who, more absolute than the most absolute tyrants, uses the fury of illy conquered passions in tormenting the unfortunate, defenseless ones. Far from being opposed here to the confessor, my wishes are for him. Priest, monk, Jesuit, behold me on his side. I pray him to interfere, if he can. He is still in this hell (of the convent) into which the law does not penetrate; the only person who can say a word in the cause of humanity. . . . . I know very well that this interference will create the strongest, the most dangerous attachment. The heart of the poor creature is given in advance to him who will defend her."[3]

We humbly suggest that the world has witnessed far more "faithful incarnations of the devil" than the "female Jesuit" of Michelet. The French revolution, brought about and consummated in blood by precisely such men as Michelet, startled the world with a hideous array of many much "more faithful incarnations." Danton, Marat, Robespierre, Barère, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and many more such worthies might well claim relationship, if not consanguinity, with the foul fiend himself. And if Michelet, and his worthy compeers, Quinet, Sue, and others of the same stamp, have not already proved their claims to the same high honor; if they have not yet made France run again with blood and stand paralysed again with horror, it is surely not from any want of the will to accomplish this result. The fearful lessons of the French revolution are wholly lost on such men; they would recklessly remove the only barrier to such another awful catastrophe—of fierce human passions rioting in blood and terror; and they seem prepared to look the consequences that may ensue calmly in the face. Alas for human nature, when unchecked by the influence of a heavenly religion!

---

[1] P. 137 note. [2] P. 141. [3] P. 159.

Again we ask, who is Michelet, that he should be entitled to credit on religious subjects? He is not only a pantheist, or outright deist, but he is also an obscure and grandiloquent transcendentalist; a man who often involves his meaning in such obscurity as to be wholly unintelligible, in or out of France; a man who walks shrouded in mystery, and who retreats, when pressed, from the clear light of truth behind a cloud of unmeaning words. Out of many illustrations of this, we select, almost at random, the following passage, which the reader may understand, if he can. The author is speaking of the spiritual death induced in the soul, according to the teaching of Molinos and the Quietists:

> "Poor, naked, ugly, and dirty, she loses the taste for everything—the understanding, the memory, the will. At last, beyond the loss of the will, she loses a *something indescribable*, 'which is her favorite,' and which would take the place of ALL, (the idea that she is a child of God.) This is properly the death to which she must arrive. No person, neither director nor any one else, can offer solace here. She must die; she must be put into the earth, that the crowd may walk above her, that she may grow putrid, rot, and suffer the odor and fetor of a corpse, until, the rottenness becoming dust and ashes, there scarcely subsists any thing which can recall the fact that the soul ever existed."[1]

If this is not all sheer nonsense, we really know not what it is. The translator, who appears to be a bold man, and not easily discouraged, is himself sorely puzzled to understand the meaning of that wonderful ALL. He says in a note:

> "Very much like nonsense; and if the reader does not understand it in English, he may be very sure that there are abundance of people who do not comprehend it in the original."

Rare consolation this, truly! By the way, we have a word to say to to this same translator; who, we suppose, is a Reverend preacher. We are probably indebted to him for the beautiful fancy titles that head each page of the book; titles which are vastly tasty, pointed, and appropriate, and which afford a sort of key to the author's meaning, where it is vague and obscure, supplying the reader with many valuable hints and ideas, which he would scarcely have derived from the mere perusal of the book itself. The trickery is transparent; and if Michelet was bad enough in the original, we may be assured that he has lost nothing of his malignity in his English dress. If the author blundered much, it may, perhaps, be some consolation to him to learn that his translator has blundered still more. He translates the French word *monde*—*the world*, instead of—*the people*, thus: "It was placed in the sacristy of the monastery, where, at nine in the evening, *the world having retired*,"[2] &c. Whither, we would ask, did the world go, when it "retired" from the monastery? Again, he speaks of "elevating a tottering Babel *two stages*," whereas we suppose that Michelet only said *two stories!* The city of Meaux, Bousset's well known episcopal see, he very wittily translates "*the Meaux*" in several places.[1] Finally, are we indebted to him or to his author for the following exquisite—shall we call it *French bull:* "several of these *ladies* are eminent business *men!*"[2]

---

[1] P. 32.

[2] P. 61.

But Michelet is not only an obscure transcendentalist and clumsy blunderer; he is not only a vulgar infidel and a base reviler of woman; but he is likewise a downright falsifier of the plainest facts. His work is made up of transparent sophistry, animated by a heartless malignity, and founded upon glaring perversion of the truth on almost every page. We cannot furnish even a catalogue of his falsehoods; they would fill a volume. We must confine ourselves to a few, as specimens. Here are two sweeping untruths in one single passage:

> "Rome surrendered Christianity—in the principle which lies at the foundation of it—*salvation by Christ.* Placed in the position to choose between that doctrine and its opposite, she had not the courage to decide. (How then did she *decide* to make the surrender referred to?) After Christianity, the Jesuits *surrendered morality*,"[3] &c.

Is not morality a part of Christianity? If so, it does not appear what Rome had left to the Jesuits to *surrender.* So absurd and so self-contradictory is error; and yet this nonsense passes current among us for sound philosophy and acute reasoning!

In another place, Michelet utters the following falsehood, which every one at all conversant with such matters knows to be a falsehood:

> "First, through the controversial works of the Jesuit Bellarmine, they (the Jesuits) stated and defended the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope *as a matter of faith.*"[4]

His self-contradictions and open absurdities are, perhaps, more numerous than even his falsehoods. They run through his entire book, which is, in fact, little more than a mere tissue of them. Thus, he reasons throughout on the assumption that priests, being celibataries, are much more exposed to temptation than other men; yet, when he comes to paint the celibatary in all the horror of his condition, he represents him as a man who leads "a dry and mutilated life," who has the fountains of his natural sympathies dried up, and who has a heart withered, hard, and unsusceptible. And how does he escape from the manifest self-contradiction? By the pitiful evasion, that "the *heart* may be dry and *sense* very eager!"[5]

Again, we ask, who is Michelet? He is a man of a heated brain, who palms off on the world his own disordered fancies and foul suspicions, as sound reasoning against celibacy and the confessional; a mere incoherent declaimer, who thinks that other people are as bad as himself, and who paints the priests as wicked men, merely because he hates them with a fiendish hatred; a man who defiles every thing that he touches, and willfully and wickedly perverts the meaning of the clearest things; a man, in fine, who will convince those who are already convinced, and will hurt those who wish to be hurt.

---

[1] P. 83, &c.
[2] P. 156.
[3] P. 41.
[4] P. 61. The italics are his.
[5] P 216, *note*. Appendix.

But does he not quote authorities, does he not reason on them? Certainly. Satan himself was an adept at quoting Scripture, as well as a subtle reasoner; yet Satan is the "father of lies." Michelet quotes different authors, but does he furnish chapter and verse? He cites authors, but what authors? Writers of both sexes, who were renegades, apostates, or infidels, and as little reliable as himself. He refers, with commendation, to Sue's Wandering Jew, the truth of which he confirms:[1] he quotes Llorente, the apostate priest and the traitor, for one of the foulest and most infamous aspersions on Catholic morality that we have ever read.[2] *He* quotes authorities, forsooth! He takes the easy method of quoting whole books at a time, and of quoting them sometimes from memory alone. And yet he is an historian and a reasoner!

Such a logician would have been likely to reach erroneous conclusions, even had he started out with correct premises; but the premises of Michelet are, in general, wholly false and untenable, as little to be relied on as his facts and authorities. The burden of his reasoning against the moral tendency of the Confessional consists in the wholly groundless assumption that, even at the present day, the principles of Quietism are those by which the confessor is regulated. And how does he defend this palpable untruth? He defends it, by showing that the Spanish Monk Molinos, and a few other obscure casuists once taught this dangerous and impure doctrine.[3] But does he not himself admit, that Molinos and his principles were publicly and solemnly condemned by the Catholic Church?[4] Does he not admit, that he was condemned for the very reasons that he himself assigns against his doctrine? Does he not admit, that this doctrine has been dead and buried for centuries? That so soon as its impure tendency was discovered, it was rejected with horror and loathing by the Church? Yes, he well knows all this; and yet he would hold the Church and the Confessional responsible for the principles of Molinos, some of the most disgusting of which he parades in his book, and gloats over with manifest delight. How blind is malignity!

And yet, gentle reader, this impure wretch, whose whole book teems with foul obscenity, treats his readers to the following curious specimen of hypocritical prudery in his preface:

> "The work presented a grave difficulty, that of speaking with decency on a subject which our adversaries have treated with incredible grossness. 'To the pure all things are pure;' I know the maxim, but I have often preferred to let my opponents escape, when I had them in my power, rather than follow them into the marsh and mire!!'"[5]

Risum teneatis? The man who indited this passage would fain persuade his readers, that the greatest and best men of the Catholic Church during the last three centuries were little better than wicked and impure hypocrites, whose whole lives were given up to libertinism, and whose whole study was to cloak it over with ingenious expedients and sophistry, that deceived every one but the acute and *pure-minded* M. Michelet; that the holy friendship of St. Francis de Sales and St. Frances de Chantal was nothing but a well sustained amour; that Fenelon's spiritual direction of Madam de Guyon and Madam de Maisonfort, and Bossuet's advices to Madam Cornuan, were prompted and guided by the same impure motive; and that this feature is apparent from the published correspondence of all those eminent and saintly personages! This foul-mouthed slander of men, whose names will be radiant with brightness and glory for centuries after his own shall have been forgotton, or remembered only with execration, runs through many long chapters of his book.

---

[1] P. 156, *note*.

[2] Pp. 178-9, *note*.

[3] The distinctive and worst feature in Quietism, was the assertion that the soul might attain to so great a degree of quietude in God as to be incapable of sin, no matter what was done in the body.

[4] P. 105.

[5] P. xiii.

He picks up a sentence here, and another there; he poisons their meaning by causing the words to pass through the alembic of his own impure mind; he strings them together to suit the theory devised by his own foul suspicions; and he thus succeeds in extracting impurity out of things the most pure, darkness out of light. Like a serpent crawling through a beautiful flower garden, and infecting the fragrant atmosphere with its pestilent breath, he succeeds in extracting nothing but poison from the sweetest and loveliest flowers. He leaves the slime of his poisonous fangs on every thing he has touched, while his hissing excites no other feelings than those of unspeakable disgust. He has not even the fascination of the serpent about him; there is "no speculation" in his dull, glaring, lustreless eye. Every one feels that the foul creature should be cast out, and be permitted to crawl only among kindred reptiles.

Such precisely was the feeling lately awakened in the French chambers, when the very book we are now examining was made a matter of complaint by certain members, who expressed their astonishment in the face of all France, that a public professor in the *College de France* should be allowed to depart from his appropriate sphere, and to prostitute his professorship to purposes so utterly vile.[1] A member friendly to Michelet was appointed to examine and report on the merits of the book, especially in reference to the professorship held by the author; and he reported that, having perused the work with attention, notwithstanding the unspeakable disgust which every page of it awakened in his bosom, he was of opinion that its author merited an indignant rebuke. There was no opposition in the chambers; the same feeling of loathing seemed to pervade all minds; and even the most unblushing infidel of them all dared not offer an apology for the author.[2]

---

[1] Michelet and Quinet, two professors in the College de France, both of whom had glaringly perverted their respective professorships of history and the literature of southern Europe into envenomed assaults on Christianity, were lately compelled, by the French government, to confine themselves to their appropriate spheres of instruction.

[2] We have derived these facts chiefly from a distinguished individual, who was in Paris at the time.

Such, then, is Michelet: the transcendentalist, the pantheist, the deist, the falsifier of the clearest facts, the open perverter of history, the foul slanderer of the great and good, the hot-headed, incoherent, raving hater of the priesthood, of Catholicity, of Christianity; the man who would, if he dared, avow the sentiment attributed to Diderot, a wish that "the last of kings should be strangled with the bowels of the last of priests;" and who would, if he had the power, re-enact in France the bloody horrors of the French revolution. And yet this man's pestilent book is re-produced in this country by Reverend preachers of the gospel of peace, charity, and truth, and commended by them to the perusal of the public! It is republished as a capital work against the errors of "popery," and as one likely to produce a powerful impression! It is well for these men to charge the Catholic Church with teaching and acting on the maxim: "The end justifies the means." They will truly have an awful account to give at the bar of God. Let them look to it in time.

Is it not after all a great honor to the Catholic Church, that her holy institutions can be attacked only by such men and by such means as these? If Catholicity could be assailed by fair means, why resort to foul? If the Confessional be so immoral in its tendency, why cannot this be shown without employing base slander and transparent falsehood? If the Catholic priesthood be so very wicked, why not prove it by other evidence than low and unworthy suspicion? Are the Protestant clergy, even in this country, so very immaculate themselves, that they can afford to throw stones at their neighbors? Is there no beam in their own eyes, that they should be so very solicitous about extracting the mote from those of their brethren? Let them take heed to themselves before the great day of account, when "the hidden things of darkness shall be made manifest, and the counsels of hearts shall be revealed."

If the Confessional be so very immoral and impure, why was not the discovery made centuries ago? How has this institution been sustained for so many ages? How did it happen that the whole Christian world, for the first fifteen centuries, revered it as an institution of God, and resorted to it as a divinely appointed means of obtaining the remission of sins, through an application made therein of the blood of Christ? How has it happened that both sexes and all classes, that men, women, and children, that Popes, bishops, priests, and laymen, that emperors and empresses, kings and queens, princes and princesses, have so long, so perseveringly, and so universally practised Confession. How has it happened, that husbands and fathers have been so long slumbering, when their nearest and dearest interests were assailed, when the very fountains of their domestic bliss were poisoned? How has it happened, that they not only looked calmly on, while their most warmly cherished affections and hopes were thus blighted, but even aided by their counsel and example in the continuance of the horrible violation?

And is it come to this, that, in the nineteenth century, in the boasted age of enlightenment and gallantry to the sex, men should be found wearing the garb of ministers of God, who give utterance to the implied aspersion, that during the first fifteen hundred years *all* the females, and during the last three centuries, *two thirds* of the females of Christendom, were and are immoral and corrupt? That this corruption has pervaded all classes from the princess to the peasant girl, and that the only means to guard against it is to abolish Confession altogether?

Gracious God! upon what times have we fallen! When what is self-styled pure and evangelical religion can be sustained only by such foul imputations on the great body of Christians; when the country is inundated with filth, in order to create and keep up this impression; when Reverend preachers lend their name and influence to such pollution; can we wonder at the wide-spread infidelity and corruption of morals so apparent in the rising generation? Can we marvel that, from the official statement of the American Almanac, *more than half of our adult population over twenty-one years of age belongs to no religion whatever?* If Christianity, in its oldest form, and as taught and practised by two-thirds of the Christian world even at the present enlightened day, in nations too the most polished and civilized, has produced, and still produces such fruits, can we wonder that men turn from it with disgust, and throw themselves into the swelling ranks of infidelity? Can we be surprised at this result, when the works of such infidels as Michelet are circulated, *by authority*, among our population, as excellent and highly useful productions?

Tell us not, that the corrupting influences of the Confessional have been conclusively established by published extracts from our own accredited theologians, Dens, Liguori, and others. Such "no-popery" champions as Sparry, the driveling apostate Smith, and many more of the same stamp, have indeed flooded our land with such publications, teeming with obscenity, *said* to be translated from our own authors; and Sparry, for acting as traveling pedler of such books, was arrested by the civil authorities in Pennsylvania. Our enemies are heartily welcome to all the laurels they have won in this campaign. They proved their own groveling impurity of mind and heart; they did not, because they could not, sully the lily-white purity of Catholicity. Their false and garbled extracts showed only their own dishonesty and baseness.

By precisely the same process of collecting and publishing in a body disjointed fragments, according to a pre-conceived theory, one might prove that the studies of law and of medicine are immoral in their tendency, and should be wholly abolished; and that even the sacred and inspired Scriptures of God teem with impurity, and are corrupting in their influence! Do not those men know, that there are in the studies of medicine and law, many very plain details on certain delicate subjects, which should not be spread out for general reading, but which, in the connection in which they stand, are highly useful, if not indispensably necessary? Do they not know that those works are strictly professional, and as such not at all blame-worthy? And why will they not have the candor and honesty, to make the same allowance in regard to Catholic theological works,—written in Latin, withdrawn by this circumstance and by their very nature from the popular gaze, and strictly *professional* in their character and tendency? Or is it proper to enter into those details *in English*,—a language accessible to all,—for the purpose of unfolding *human* laws, and treating the ills of the body, and not proper to do the same in *Latin*,—a language hidden from the multitude,—for the much higher and nobler purpose of developing the *divine* law, and unfolding the necessary remedies for the maladies of the soul?

Do not the holy Scriptures themselves furnish us with a precedent for this? Are there not many chapters in the Bible which a pure-minded female would not venture to read aloud in company? And is the Bible corrupt for this? What would be thought of another Sparry or Smith, who should be at the pains of collecting together and publishing in one volume, with a running commentary, all those Scriptural extracts, for the purpose of establishing the immorality of the Bible? And what are we to think of the men who have republished and who circulate with zealous commendation the thoroughly infamous book of Michelet, in which the foul infidel more than intimates that the Canticle of Canticles, or Song of Solomon, is little more than a mere love song breathing, in "burning language," the sentiments of a carnal affection; and who tries to prove that the great Bossuet was a carnal-minded and corrupt man, because in his correspondence with Madam Cornuan, he employs and comments upon the language of that Canticle?[1] Out upon such pretended delicacy, and real hypocrisy! One feels almost tempted to exclaim with Shakspeare:

"Now step I forth to whip hypocrisy."

The real secret of all this clamor against the Confessional is found in the simple fact, that Confession is very hard to flesh and blood, and exceedingly humbling to human pride. It is very painful, to feel compelled to reveal our wickedness to a fellow-creature as sinful as ourselves. But this very feature of Confession is, perhaps, the strongest proof of its divine origin. Christianity in its very nature wars against flesh and blood, and inculcates self-denial and humility. The practice of Confession is highly calculated to keep alive this feeling. How is it possible that man would and could ever have introduced a doctrine so very painful? How is it possible that mankind could have been persuaded to adopt a practice so very humbling, unless they firmly believed that Christ himself had enjoined it as a command, and as an essential condition for obtaining pardon of sin? Whoever knows anything of human nature, knows that, however easy it may be to introduce changes for the worse, it is utterly impossible to persuade men to change for the better, without a clear divine warrant and sanction. We venture to say, that all the preachers of all the jarring sects in Christendom together would not be able, by joint combination and effort, to introduce any such change, or to persuade even a dozen of their respective flocks to resort to Confession.

---

[1] Page 96, seq. In a long note, the author furnishes us with extracts from Bossuet's correspondence, in which the expressions he (Michelet) reprobates most, are precisely those of the divine Spouse of the Canticles! Where *spiritual* love alone is indicated, accompanied by *spiritual* union with the divine Spouse, he can understand nothing but mere carnal love! He attempts to prove that Bossuet, the great adversary of even the most mitigated form of Quietism, was in reality a Quietist himself, merely because he wrote this commentary on the Canticle of Canticles! The beautiful devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus he perverts in the same vile way. (Page 112, seqq.). These are pretty fair specimens of his mind and heart, and of his *reasoning*.

But again : if the priests introduced Confession, why did they not take the prudent precaution to exempt themselves from its obligation ? Why do priests, bishops, and Popes still hold themselves divinely bound to practise this humbling observance ? What possible motive could have induced them to enjoin Confession for the first time ? Was it, that they might impose on themselves a new burden, much more painful than any other in the whole ministry,—a burden which weighs down their energies, engrosses so much of their time, taxes so heavily their patience, and withal presents not one worldly inducement to continue its laborious ministrations ? Do men usually act, not only without an adequate motive, but even against all motives of self-interest ?

Finally, if the priests introduced Confession, *when* did they do it; *under what circumstances ; how* did they succeed in persuading mankind to adopt the observance ; *who* first taught the doctrine ; *who* opposed its introduction ? These questions have been often asked ; they have never been answered. History says nothing whatever on all those important circumstances ; and yet they would have been carefully recorded, had any innovation of the kind been attempted. All Christendom would have cried out against a change so painful to nature ; and history would have re-echoed the voice of the indignant protest, which would have gone forth. Such was invariably the case in regard to attempted innovations of much less practical importance.

We have now done with Michelet and his loathsome book. We have devoted to it more space than it deserved; but we have done it, because the work has appeared in this country under Protestant auspices, as an element in the bitter and most unscrupulous warfare now waged against Catholicity in this *free* republic. We have employed strong language, but not half so strong as the book and the author merited. If the preachers who lead the anti-Catholic crusade will be caught in such company, if they will use means so thoroughly vile to promote their objects, can they complain that they should be denounced in strong language ? For the great body of the people, misled by their artifices, we have no words of harshness; we have but tears of compassion to drop over their cruel condition in having such leaders. The meek and humble Saviour strongly and severely rebuked the ancient Pharisees, out of compassion for the victims of their hypocrisy; we have but sought to aim at the imitation of His example.

PART III.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Reviews, Essays, and Lectures.

PART III—MISCELLANEOUS.

XXV. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.*

ARTICLE I. ENGLAND AND FRANCE—HOLLAND AND BELGIUM.

Influence of Catholicity and Protestantism on material interests—Current theory—The argument wholly inconclusive—And the facts assumed, but not proved—England's prosperity—How explained—Rise and decline of Catholic powers—Why God permits the wicked to prosper—Masses of England's population—Catholic Ireland—England and France compared—In which is the bulk of the people more comfortable?—Laing's argument—French and English honesty and politeness—Holland and Belgium compared—Belgian railroads—Charity in Catholic and Protestant countries—Condition of the poor—Relative prosperity of the Catholic and Protestant population of Prussia—The serf system—How long it lingered in Protestant countries—Who have been the best friends and champions of the poor and oppressed?

We have heard it asserted, over and over again, that Protestant countries are much more free, more enlightened, more industrious, more enterprising, more prosperous, more moral, and more happy, than those which have remained faithful to the Catholic religion; and it has become fashionable to assume, that this alleged superiority is fairly ascribable to the self-styled reformation. This great religious revolution of the sixteenth century, say its friends, emancipated the human mind from a degrading thraldom, and thereby gave a new impulse to human activity, the results of which are seen in the social ameliorations above indicated. While Catholic countries have remained stationary under the influence of a stationary religious system, Protestant countries, under the influence of one, the leading feature of which is progress, have advanced, and have shot immeasurably ahead of their neighbors.

Such is the current theory, which we propose briefly to examine in the present paper. The theory evidently consists of two parts: one, the assumption of the fact, that Protestant countries are superior to those which are Catholic; and the other, the inference, that the superiority in question is to be ascribed to the influence of the Protestant reformation. We propose to investigate each of these positions, in order to ascertain how far the assumed fact is to be relied on, and how far the inference

---

***Notes of a Traveler on the Social and Political State of France, Prussia, Switzerland, Italy, and other parts of Europe, during the present century.* By Samuel Laing, Esq., author of "A Journal of a Residence in Norway" and "A Tour in Sweden." From the second London edition. Philadelphia: Carey & Hart, 1846. 1 vol. 8 vo drawn from it is sound or logical. The subject opens before us a vast and most interesting field of investigation, which Mr. Laing has surveyed with great keen-sightedness and ability, making his observations with patience and accuracy, stating his facts with boldness and precision, and drawing his conclusions with his usual acuteness and candor.[1]

Should any be disposed to question his authority, we beg to remind them, that he is a Scotchman, a Protestant, and, for aught we know, a Presbyterian; that he manifests his dislike of the Catholic Church throughout his work; and that he does not deal in declamation or mere assertion, but in sober facts and stringent arguments. Does it detract from his authority that he is candid? Should he be spurned, because he has the courage to state facts, and to publish truths new and unpalatable to his co-religionists? Should not every sensible man be rather inclined to view him with favor from the circumstance that he has had the independence to break the trammels of sect, and to fling to the winds the stale misrepresentations of centuries? Surely, one would think so. And we hail the recent appearance of this and of similar works among us, under Protestant auspices, as an omen of a better spirit and of better times; of a disposition to allow at least *a portion* of the truth to be told, in regard to those who profess that venerable religion, which was hallowed by the lives and deaths of thousands and millions eminent for their sanctity, for long centuries before the jarring discord of Protestantism broke on the world. We have been but too long the mere slaves of English prejudice, especially in religion; it is high time to assert our independence. The day is gone by, when the rusty lamp of English bigotry shall exercise over us the same despotic influence as did the lamp of Aladdin over its slaves: we should break our bonds, and be free. Such men precisely as Samuel Laing will act as the pioneers of this new revolution, destined to be more important in its results than was that which secured our political independence.

We shall confine our remarks, as Mr. Laing does, to the more conspicuous countries of Europe; and we shall endeavor to be as succinct as the nature of the subject will allow.

And, in the first place, suppose that we admit all that is asserted; would it thence follow that Protestantism is true or divine, and Catholicity false? Did Christ ever assign, as a distinctive characteristic of His religion, that it should be the best calculated to promote human comfort, and to insure temporal prosperity, whether to individuals or to nations? Were these merely temporal considerations among the primary, or even secondary objects He had in view in establishing His holy religion? If so, then why did He not originate some at least of the great inventions of which our moderns boast so much, as having changed the very face of society? Why did He not deliver lectures on commerce, navigation, manufactures, and political economy? Why did He not assume the state and pomp of a great king, or at least the garb of a great political philosopher, to renovate the social condition, by remodeling society itself, through His superior authority and wisdom? We do not read that He did any thing of all this; or that, in fact, He either directly or indirectly alluded in His discourses to any of those great improvements which distinguish modern from ancient society.

---

[1] The Edinburg Review assigns to Mr. Laing a very high position among those recent travelers who have added to our stock of information in regard to foreign countries.

We read, on the contrary, that He spoke continually in praise of poverty, of humility, of self-denial, of separation from the world in heart and affection, of leaving all things for His name's sake, of selling all things, and giving the proceeds to the poor, and of then taking up our cross and following Him, that we might have a reward in a better world. The poor, the miserable, the diseased, and the forsaken, were His favorites, and those who abounded in riches and reveled in luxury were the objects of His aversion. In a word, He taught, both by word and by example, an utter contempt for the things most prized in this world, and a constant aspiration after those of the world to come; and this is a distinctive feature of His holy religion. Therefore, if we even admit that Protestant countries are, in a worldly point of view, more prosperous than Catholic countries, and that this prosperity is owing to the Protestant religion, it would not thence follow that Protestantism is the religion of Christ, and that Catholicity is not. On the contrary, the presumption would be, that a religion, which thus tends primarily to promote mere worldly comforts, is of the earth, earthly; that it is not at least that sublime and supernatural system taught by Jesus Christ, and intended to raise mankind above this world. Thus the whole reasoning of Protestants upon the alleged superiority of Protestant countries is based upon false principles, and falls to the ground of itself; or, if it prove any thing, clearly leads to the inference, that Protestantism, in its ends, objects, and very nature, is a different thing altogether from original Christianity.

In thus attempting to show the utter inconclusiveness of a popular argument against Catholicity and in favor of Protestantism, we do not mean to imply, that the temporal prosperity of a nation or of an individual is incompatible with the profession and practice of true Christianity; far from it. A people may be wealthy, and yet be composed of true Christians; but they will not necessarily be true Christians because they are wealthy, nor wealthy because they are true Christians. The two things are not incompatible, yet they are not necessarily associated together. On the contrary, from the very genius and nature of Christianity, we would be naturally led to infer, that they are oftener found apart than united. And this is all that the argument calls for. So much for the soundness of the principles, which lie at the foundation of this whole argument against Catholicity.

We will now proceed to examine the two positions of modern Protestant writers, stated at the commencement of this paper; and we will begin with the one which ascribes the alleged superiority of Protestant over Catholic countries to the influence of the Protestant religion.

I. Assuming the fact as established, is the mode of accounting for it either satisfactory or logical? Is the superiority in question necessarily the result of a difference in religion? May it not be accounted for on other principles; such as, a difference of character in different masses of population, a difference of climate, of social habits, of agricultural or commercial facilities, of government? We think it may, and that such is the only rational or consistent theory by which we can satisfactorily account for the difference, if a difference really exist to be accounted for; which, as we trust to show in the sequel, is more than doubtful. And we shall be fully borne out in this by the unexceptionable authority and conclusive reasoning of Mr. Laing himself, as we shall see. If people are prosperous, wealthy, and happy, merely because they are Protestants, then all Protestant nations should be prosperous, wealthy, and happy; which is very far from being the case. If we except England, the Protestant countries of Europe have really little to boast of, in any of these respects, over their Catholic neighbors.

If commercial activity, and manufacturing industry and skill, be prominent elements of social prosperity and national wealth, then we freely admit, that England stands forth proudly pre-eminent above all other European nations, whether Protestant or Catholic. She is, confessedly, the most commercial and enterprising nation in the world. Her commerce covers the ocean, and, like a mighty collossus, bestrides the earth. Her manufactures seek and find a market in the new and in the old world, in the islands of the Pacific and in those of the Indian ocean, in Australasia and in China. But is all this successful commercial and manufacturing enterprise a necessary result of her Protestantism? Can it not be explained on other principles altogether? Her insular position, the natural activity of her people, their all-absorbing love of wealth, the colonial policy and grasping ambition of her government, her unscrupulousness as to the means so the end be secured, and many other considerations of a similar character, may account for the fact, much more satisfactorily than her profession of the Protestant religion.

To listen to the declamation of some English writers on the vast commercial superiority of their country, one would almost imagine that no other nation, especially that no Catholic nation, had ever won laurels in this field of human activity, and that all the glory and all the triumphs were reserved to England, under the quickening influence of the Protestant reformation. Is such really the fact? Who gave the first impulse to this species of enterprise? Who were the first pioneers of modern maritime discovery, and thereby laid the foundations of modern commerce? Who discovered a new world, and opened a new and boundless field to commercial adventure? The Catholic Columbus, sent out, in 1492, by the Catholic sovereigns of Catholic Spain. Who first doubled the Cape of Good Hope? The Catholic Vasco de Gama, sent out, in 1497, by Catholic Portugal. Who first discovered the East Indies and Brazil? The Catholic mariner, Pedro Alvarez Cabral, likewise in the service of

Portugal![1] Who first discovered that powerful modern agent, steam, and applied it to navigation? The Catholic Spaniard, Blasco de Garay, who, in 1543, made the first successful experiment of the kind in the harbor of Barcelona, in presence of the Emperor, Charles V, and of all his court.[2] And, long before any of these triumphs of modern times in the field of discovery and enterprise, who first awakened Europe to a sense of the utility and importance of exploring the resources of remote lands? What Catholic pioneers were they, who, in the good old Catholic times, centuries before the reformation had dawned on the world, first stirred up a noble emulation in the minds of men by their glowing accounts of distant countries, and stimulated them to enter at once upon the brilliant path of discovery? The Catholic navigators and travelers, the Venitian brothers, Nicholas and Maffeo Polo, in the thirteenth century,[3] and the Catholic Mandeville, in the fourteenth.[4] Who contributed, more perhaps than any other body of men, to the stock of geographical and statistical knowledge, and thereby increased so much the resources of modern commerce? The Catholic missionaries, in different centuries, who traversed the most distant countries on their errand of divine mercy, and who freely communicated to the world the knowledge they had gleaned in their extensive travels. And these noble harbingers of civilization, be it ever remembered, were the special agents of the Catholic Church, and were generally, if not always, sent out by the Roman Pontiffs. If these things are so, Protestant England should not surely boast of having done everything in this department of human knowledge and activity.

It is a fact, notorious to all who have but glanced at the pages of history, that, centuries before England had attained to her present commercial pre-eminence, the Catholic republics of Venice, Genoa, Florence, and Pisa, in Italy, and the Catholic towns which composed the Hanseatic League of the middle ages, in Germany, were the great commercial carriers of the world, and occupied the high position which England now occupies. It is another fact equally notorious, that the Catholic kingdoms of Spain and Portugal were far in advance of England, in commercial activity and successful maritime enterprise, during the fifteenth, sixteenth, and the greater part of the seventeenth century; and that, during a portion of the same period, and for a century later, Catholic France was able to contend with her, and often with brilliant success, for maritime pre-eminence. It is only within the last century that England has been able fully to establish her claim to be mistress of the high seas, and the arbitress of commerce. It is, then, as clear as the light of day, that England does not owe her present superiority to the influence of the Protestant religion, but to other circumstances altogether.

[1] For these and several other facts of similar import, see Irving's "Columbus," vol. ii, p. 76, seqq.— Edit. New York, 1831.

[2] For an account of this experiment, see "A Year in Spain," vol. i, p. 47.— Edit. New York, 1830.

[3] Their different voyages were made between the years 1255 and 1295, when they returned loaded with riches. See Irving's Columbus, ii, 290, seqq.— Edit. *supra*.

[4] Between 1322 and 1372, when he died at Leige, in France. Ibid. p. 303, seqq.

And what are these circumstances? Has England any reason to boast of them? Or rather, has she not reason to blush and to hide her face with shame, as often as they are recalled to her remembrance? Who were the first pioneers of English commerce, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? What was their character, and what their standing in veridical history? How do they compare with the early Catholic navigators, in honor, elevation of views, and common honesty? If there is any truth in history, as set forth even by such of our own Protestant writers as Irving, Bancroft, and Prescott, the early Catholic navigators were, in general, men of high bearing and chivalrous character, who would not stoop to do a mean thing; while the early English navigators, such as Gosnold, Gilbert, and Weymouth, and, we may add, Raleigh, Drake, and Hawkins, were unscrupulous, bold, bad men, as dishonest as they were enterprising; little better, in fact, than accomplished buccaniers and pirates. Yes, *pirates;* they deserve no softer name; for they made it a rule to seize upon the property and possessions of the Spaniards, Portuguese, and French, whenever opportunity offered, and in time of profound peace as well as of war. And what is more remarkable, the English government, instead of punishing them for their robberies on the high seas, or their unprincipled aggressions on the often defenseless colonies of its Catholic neighbors, winked at their excesses, and even rewarded them for their boldness and success. If Protestantism inclined England to adopt this line of policy, and if Protestantism formed the character of her early navigators, then is Protestantism fully welcome to all the glory of having laid the foundation of England's commercial greatness in modern times. Perhaps, the secret of her success may be, that, as a nation, she was emancipated by the reformation from the harassing thraldom of a conscience; and her Catholic neighbors, not having been vouchsafed the same amount of light or freedom, still went on in the old fashioned way of doing what is right, and committing consequences to God. We do not assert this as a fact; we merely offer it as a theory,—as plausible at least, and as well founded, as that which ascribes England's modern greatness to her Protestantism.

But if Catholicity be true, and Protestantism false, how and why could God's providence permit that the Catholic countries above named should decline, and that Protestant England should attain to so unexampled a prosperity? We might answer this question — which has often puzzled the simple-minded inquirer — by asking another of a similar import: why does God often permit wicked men to accumulate wealth and roll in luxury, while the virtuous are often poor, miserable, and on the verge of starvation? Why are Jews generally wealthy, and Christians often poor and destitute? Is it because the wicked are more the favorites of heaven than the good? Or is it for a precisely contrary reason;—that according to the views of God, who takes in eternity along with time, riches are usually a curse, and poverty a blessing. Is it because the virtuous, who seek after eternal blessings and disparage those of time, are reserved for a higher recompense than this world can bestow; and the wicked, who seek only this world, and have to expect no ulterior reward, are often remunerated for their merely human virtues with merely human and temporal blessings? Is it that the awful saying of our Blessed Lord, in reference to the proud Pharisees who sought only human praise — THEY HAVE RECEIVED THEIR REWARD — is verified in their regard? Has England received her reward in this world, and is she to look for nothing beyond it? Are her grasping ambition, and her quenchless desire to accumulate wealth and to extend her power by all means, whether lawful or not, really deserving of any higher reward? The day of judgment will reveal this, and many other awful things, in regard both to individuals and to nations. Till then, other nations less favored may hold up their heads, and bide their time, with bosoms filled with hope.

II. But let us look a little more closely into this boasted commercial greatness of England, and see how it affects the masses of the English population, how far it promotes their worldly happiness, and how their social condition compares with that of their Catholic neighbors on the continent of Europe. This will naturally bring us to the examination of the second question proposed above: whether it be really a fact that England and other Protestant nations are so much in advance of Catholic countries in social condition and in the comforts of every day life.

Is it, then, true, that superior commercial activity and greater skill in manufactures are the means best calculated to promote the *general* happiness of a people? Do they enrich the masses, or do they not rather enrich the few at the expense of the many? Look at England, and what do you see? A land of the boldest social contrasts: overgrown fortunes in the few, and squalid misery in the many; splendid palaces, and miserable hovels; men and women rolling in brilliant equipages, and haggard multitudes crying aloud for bread to prevent starvation, at their very carriage windows; speculators amassing enormous wealth in the manufacturing districts, and a mass of wretched operatives worked almost to death, and nearly starving in the midst of their hard labor to sustain life;[1] immense profits realized by avaricious capitalists, while the price of labor is cut down to the very starving point: in a word, active industry and bold enterprise everywhere, and yet a laboring population often badly clothed, badly fed, and badly housed, and very far from being either well instructed or moral.[1]

---

[1] That great poet and humorist, the late Thomas Hood, has admirably hit off the condition of the laboring poor in England, in his "Song of the Shirt." We will insert three stanzas of this whimsical, but feeling little poem, in which the poor, hard-worked female operative is represented as holding a sad soliloquy with herself on her hard condition. The case may apply as well to laborers of the other sex, if not even better.

"But why do I talk of death,
That phantom of grisly bone;
I hardly fear his terrible shape,
It seems so like my own: —
It seems so like my own,
Because of the fasts I keep,—
O God! that bread should be so dear,
And flesh and blood so cheap!

"Work, work, work!
My labor never flags;
And what are its wages? A bed of straw —
A crust of bread — and rags.
That shattered roof — and this naked floor—
A table — a broken chair —
And a wall so blank, my shadow I thank
For sometimes falling there.

"O! but to breathe the breath
Of the cowslip and primrose sweet —
With the sky above my head
And the grass beneath my feet,
For only one short hour,
To feel as I used to feel,
Before I knew the woes of want,
And the work that costs a meal!"

For the truth of this picture, we appeal with confidence to the official reports recently presented to the British parliament, setting forth the condition of the operatives in the manufacturing districts and in the collieries. The philosophic observer will not fail to trace this sad poverty and misery of the laboring population of England to that insatiate spirit of avarice — so common in highly commercial communities — which abstracts money from the pockets of the many to put it into those of the few, who have already more than they can usefully dispose of. Nor can it be denied, that the Protestant principle of private judgment in religious matters, a principle that sets up each man for himself, and, as it were, isolates him from the society in which he lives, has tended greatly to foster a selfish spirit in the rich, to feed their avarice, and to render them insensible to the hardships and plaints of poverty. While England was Catholic, charity was a golden coin which freely circulated everywhere; since she has become Protestant, it is seldom heard of, except at public dinners, or in fashionable subscription lists. Those who do such high-sounding charities "have their reward!"

The impoverished and miserable condition of Catholic Ireland is sometimes pointed to, as an instance of the improvidence which Catholicity generates in those who profess its principles; while the superior wealth and thriftiness of the Irish and English Protestant population of the island are proudly set forth, as the natural results of Protestantism. Shame on those who seriously allege this as an argument! What, but English tyranny and Protestant rapacity, brought about this difference in the condition of the Catholic and Protestant Irish? What, but the most heartless avarice and the most grinding oppression, originally caused, and has since perpetuated the miseries of Catholic Ireland? Is it fair or generous first to rob a man of his land and rifle his pockets, and then taunt him with his poverty and degradation? Yet this is precisely what is done by those who strive to make such capital out of the sufferings of poor Ireland. At least three-fourths of the landed estate in Ireland are in the hands of Protestants, who constitute scarcely an eighth of the population; and, in most instances, this property was wrested from the original Catholic proprietors by the most lawless and high-handed violence — by confiscation backed by military force. Protestantism has surely no reason to be proud of its ascendency of wealth and influence in Ireland; and the Irish Catholics have much greater reason to boast of their poverty, induced as it was by their firm attachment to the ancient faith, than have Irish Protestants to vaunt their ill-gotten wealth. Protestant political economists should never even breathe the name of Ireland, lest it should choke their utterance.

---

[1] We will treat this subject in detail in a subsequent article.

England and France may offer a fairer example of the relative social conditions of two neighboring masses of population, the one Protestant and the other Catholic. Mr. Laing has instituted the comparison between them, and we are willing to abide by his candid judgment in the matter. Considering that he is a British subject, with strong prejudices against both the religion and the policy of France, his authority is surely unexceptionable. We will endeavor to exhibit, in a very condensed form, the results of his observations and reasoning in regard to the social features of each country.

The chief point of difference between England and France is connected with the laws of inheritance. In England there exists an hereditary aristocracy who hold, by regular descent from the father to the *eldest* son, much the largest portion of the landed property. The law provides for this entailment of vast landed estates by the most rigid enactments. A titled landlord is not allowed to divide or diminish his property in lands; he can only use the fruits of them during his life-time, when they descend entire to the oldest son. The natural result of this feature in English social economy is, that the land is in the hands of the few, and that the vast body of the English agricultural population consists of mere tenants, wholly dependent on the great landlords. In France the case is widely different. The law of primogeniture was abolished in 1789; and the effect of the abolition has been, to destroy the hereditary aristocracy with vast entailed estates, and to make at least one-half of the entire population landed proprietors, thereby giving them a direct interest in the soil, and stimulating them to increased industry. According to the statistical returns lately published by M. Dupin, "the amount of arable land at present in France is little more than it was in 1789, but the population is increased by about eight millions; and in consequence of the division of property by the law of succession, one-half of the whole population are proprietors, and, counting their families, two-thirds of the whole are engaged in the direct cultivation of the soil."[1]

The result of this sub-division of property has been — as Mr. Laing clearly proves against Arthur Young and the Edinburg reviewers — greatly to improve the social condition of the French population, to add to their comforts, and to develop to a much greater extent the resources of the soil. Instead of vast estates but half cultivated, France is now cut up into smaller properties, to which the principles of garden culture have been applied.

The beneficial changes brought about in little more than half a a century, during which the experiment has been tried, present a very satisfactory proof that the abolition of entailment in estates has been of vast utility to the mass of the people, and afford likewise an earnest of still greater improvement in the social condition of France. Nay, more; Mr. Laing proves that the condition of the French people is better and more *comfortable* than that of the English in similar circumstances. We will extract a portion of his testimony and reasoning on this curious subject:

---

[1] Quoted by Laing; p 74.

"What is the condition of their (the French) laboring class at present, compared to that of our own? The only means of comparison is to take one class of men, whose condition is in all countries the same relatively to that of the common laborer, the military — and to compare the condition of the common laborer in each country, with that of the common soldier. Now in England, since 1816, no bounty, or even trifling bounty, is required to obtain recruits for the army; and none but men of the best description as to age, health, and stature, are received. The inference to be made is, that the condition of our common soldier is so much better than, or so equal to, the condition of our common laborer, that little or no inducement of bounty is required to make able-bodied men enlist in sufficient numbers. But the condition of our soldier has not been altered for the better since the peace, since 1816. It is the condition of our laboring class that has altered for the worse. In England, as in France, the soldier is fed, paid, lodged, and clothed, precisely as he was five and twenty years ago. But in France, although the term of service is only for six years, so far are the laboring class from such a condition as to enlist without the inducement of bounty, that from 1800 to 2000 francs, or £80 sterling, are usually offered for a recruit, to serve as a substitute for one who is drawn by ballot for the army. Clubs and assurance companies are established all over France, for providing substitutes for the members who may happen to be drawn for the service. The inference to be made is, that here the condition of the common laborer is too good to be exchanged for that of the common soldier, without the inducement of a premium; his labor too valuable to be given for the mere living and pay of the soldier, although the soldier's pay and living are as good, in proportion to the habits of the people and price of provisions, as in England. How ludicrous, as one sits on the deck of a fine steam-vessel going down the Saone, or the Rhone, or the Seine, passing every half hour other steam-vessels, and every five or six miles under iron suspension bridges, and past canals, short factory railroads even, and new built factories — how laughable now to read the lugubrious predictions of Arthur Young half a century ago, of Birbeck a quarter of a century ago, of the Edinburg Review some twenty years ago, about the inevitable consequences of the French law of succession! 'A pauper warren!' Look up from the page, and laugh. Look around upon the actual prosperity, the well-being, and the rising industry of this people under their system. Look at the activity on their rivers, at the new factory chimneys against the horizon, at the steamboats, canals, roads, coal works, wherever nature gives any opening to enterprise." [1]

But it is not only in the physical comforts of life, that the bulk of the French people are much better off than that of the English; it is also in matters of higher moment,— in honesty, in politeness, and in the suavity and high tone of social intercourse. Let us again listen to the candid Scotchman:

"Let us do justice to the French character. Their self-command, their upon-honor principle, is very remarkable and much more generally diffused than among our own population. THEY ARE, I BELIEVE, A MORE HONEST PEOPLE THAN THE BRITISH. The beggar, who is evidently hungry, respects the fruit upon the road-side within his reach, although there is nobody to protect it. Property is much respected in France; and in bringing up children, this fidelity towards the property of others seems much more carefully inculcated by parents in the lowest class, in the home education of their children, than with us. This respect for the property is closely connected with that respect for the feelings of our neighbors, which constitutes what is called good manners. This is carefully inculcated on children of all ranks in France. They are taught to do what is pleasing and agreeable to others. We are too apt to undervalue this spirit, as tending merely to superficial accomplishments, to empty compliment in words, and unmeaning appearance in acts. But, in reality, this reference to the feelings of others in all we do is a moral habit of great value, where it is generally diffused, and enters into the home training of every family. It is an education both of the parent and child in morals, carried on through the medium of external manners. Our lower and middle classes are deficient in this kind of family education. . . . . . It is a fine distinction of the French national character, and social economy, that practical morality is more generally taught through manners, among and by the people themselves, than in any country in Europe. One or two striking instances of this general respect for property have occurred to me in traveling in France. I once forgot my umbrella in a diligence going to Bordeaux, in which I traveled as far as Tours. My umbrella went on to Bordeaux and returned to Tours in the corner of the coach, without being appropriated by any of the numerous passengers, or work people, who must have passed through it on so long a journey, and had this stray unowned article before them. I once traveled from Paris to Boulogne with a gentleman who had come up the same road a few days before. We were conversing on this very subject, the honesty of the people in general, and he recollected having left, on the table of one of the inns, half a basket of grapes, worth about twelve sous, which, he said, he was sure he would find safe. On arriving, he asked the waiter if he had seen the grapes, and they were instantly produced, as a matter of course, out of a press in which they had been carefully put away as property not belonging to the house."[1]

---

[1] Pages 77, 8.

These little incidents speak volumes for the honesty of the French people. We venture to say, that if an umbrella were lost in a stage coach in England, the United States, or any Protestant country of Europe, the owner would never even think of its recovery. In those countries, these and similar articles are but too often regarded as common property, to be appropriated by the finder.

Protestant Holland and Catholic Belgium present another very fair field of comparison between the relative social comforts and prosperity of the Protestant and Catholic populations in Europe. The two little kingdoms are immediately adjoining each other; and until the tyranny and intolerance of the Dutch government drove the Belgians into a revolution in 1830, they had formed but one kingdom, ever since the settlement of Europe by the allied powers, at the congress of Vienna in 1815. Now what is the relative condition of these two people? There is no comparison between them. In industry, in enterprise, in manufactures, in agriculture, in enlightenment, and in political liberty, the Catholic Belgians are immeasurably ahead of the Protestant Dutch. All Belgium is cultivated as a garden; it is filled, like France, with small landed proprietors, whose industry fully brings out the resources of the soil, and fills the country with abundance. It is, in proportion to the territory, the most populous, as well as the most prosperous country in Europe. It is certainly the freest and the most tolerant monarchy in the world.

---

[1] Pages 79, 80.

33

In one thing only can Holland claim the precedency over Belgium — in commerce; but even in this respect, Holland has greatly declined of late, notwithstanding the great advantages of her position:

> "In the deserted streets of Delft, and Leyden, and Haarlem," says Mr. Laing, "the grass is growing through the seams of the brick pavements; the ragged petticoat flutters in the wind out of the drawing-room casements of a palace; the echo of wooden shoes, clattering through empty saloons, tells of past magnificence — of actual indigence."[1]

Even during the period of her greatest commercial prosperity, when her honest burghers suddenly became purse-proud millionaires, and her fleets contended with those of England for the ascendency on the high seas, the mass of her population derived but little benefit from the overgrown fortunes of the few lucky adventurers:

> "How little the mass of the people of the Seven United Provinces, the boors or peasants, or even the burgesses of the middle and lower classes, had been acted upon by the wealth and prosperity of the commercial class in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, may be seen in their dwellings, furniture, clothing, and enjoyments, and habits of civilized life. These are all of the make, material, and age, prior to the rise of the power and opulence of Holland — of the age of Queen Elizabeth — and have remained, unchanged and unimproved, until that power and opulence have fallen again to the level from which they rose. A commercial class, an aristocracy of capitalists, numerous perhaps as a moneyed body, but nothing as a national mass, were alone acted upon by this commercial prosperity; and when trade gradually removed to other countries, the Dutch capitalist, without changing his domicil, easily transferred his capital to where the use of it was wanted and profitable. Holland remains a country full of capitalists and paupers; her wealth giving little employment, comparatively, to her own population in productive industry, and adding little to their prosperity, well-being, and habits of activity in producing and enjoying the objects of civilized life."[2]

Belgium was the first country on the continent of Europe to engage actively in the building of railroads; and at present her whole territory is covered with a net-work of these valuable improvements, affording the greatest facilities for travel and the transport of merchandise. No one has visited that country, who has not been struck by the perfect system under which her railroads are organized. Holland, on the contrary, after a lapse of nearly twenty years, has scarcely yet begun to build railroads.

While Belgium has the best railroads, the briskest manufactures, and the most free and thriving population on the continent of Europe, Holland has little to depend on but her commerce, and this resource has now well nigh failed her. The poor abound in every district, and their condition is indeed deplorable in the extreme. Even the charitable institutions devised for their relief are, like most other institutions of the kind in Protestant countries, little better than state prisons, or else they are agricultural colonies in barren places beyond the Zuyder Zee, in which paupers are compelled to labor, like English convicts sent out to Botany bay.[1] Mr. Laing gives the following appreciation of the Dutch character as compared with the English:

---

[1] Page 40.

[2] Page 43

> "The Dutch people, eminently charitable and benevolent as a public, their country full of beneficent institutions admirably conducted and munificently supported, are, as individuals, somewhat rough, hard, and, although it be uncharitable to say so, uncharitable and unfeeling. We have, too, at home, our excellent benevolent men, who will subscribe their sovereign, or their twenty, to an hospital, house of refuge, or missionary or charitable society for the relief or instruction of the poor; but, on principle, withhold their penny from the shivering female on their door-steps, imploring alms for the pale, sickly infant in her arms. They are right on principle and consideration, quite right; but one is not particularly in love with such quite-right people. The instinct of benevolence in the heart is worth a whole theory of such political economy in the head."[2]

We may here remark, in general, that there is much more real charity exhibited towards the poor in Catholic than in Protestant countries. In the former, besides individual alms cheerfully and unostentatiously bestowed, there are splendid public charities richly endowed in all the great cities, where everything is provided for the comfort and consolation of the destitute of all classes. These charities are not mere state establishments, supported by a burdensome taxation, and served by state hirelings at so much a day, as are the "admirably conducted and munificently supported" charitable institutions of Holland, and of all other Protestant countries with which we are acquainted; but they are often the creations of a real Christian charity in individuals, who bestow freely and abundantly of their wealth for this noble purpose; and they are not served by mercenaries, who seem disposed to do just as little as is compatible with retaining their situation and drawing their stated salary, but by men and women, who act from religious motives, and freely and cheerfully do whatever is in their power for the relief of suffering humanity; and all this for the love of God, whose special favorites the poor are considered to be by the Catholic Church. Whoever will take the trouble fully and impartially to examine the history and character of Protestant and Catholic charities, cannot fail to notice these characteristic traits in both, and to mark the vast superiority of the latter over the former, in all the particulars above indicated. Exceptions there may be, but the general rule is as we have stated it.

There seems to be this remarkable difference between the condition of the poor in Catholic and in Protestant countries; that, whereas, in the latter, they are viewed by the law, and too often by the people themselves, as state criminals, and are treated accordingly; in the former, they are regarded as objects of compassion, and are almost always accosted with kindness, and treated with tenderness. Vagrant, vagabond—no epithet is too strong for the English or even American beggar. Is not this but too often the case amongst ourselves? And yet, are our Protestant brethren generally uncharitable? We do not say so. The fault is more that of society than of individuals; more that of their religion than of any natural hard-heartedness in its professors. Protestantism, we repeat it, necessarily fosters a spirit of isolation, of individualism, of selfishness, of pride; and it was only Protestantism that could have made generally current the popular maxim: "Every man for himself, and God for us all!" In Catholic countries, the social feeling is much stronger, and such a maxim would grate harshly on the popular ear; its general acceptance would be impossible.

---

[1] For a description of these colonies, see Laing, p. 48, seqq.

[2] Page 46

Mr. Laing not only asserts, but proves, that the Catholic population of Prussia is more industrious, enterprising, and wealthy, as well as more free and enlightened on their rights and wants, than the Protestant population of the same kingdom. He also shows that this superiority is fairly traceable, not only to their position on the Rhine and in the vicinity of France or Poland, but also to their principles as Catholics, exempting them from the iron religious supremacy of the Prussian monarch, and placing their spiritual rights under the special guardianship of the Roman Pontiff.[1] He says:

> "Her Rhenish and Westphalian provinces are not only wealthy and manufacturing; they are liberal, and hang very loosely to the autocratic principle of the Prussian government. They retained, when they were handed over to Prussia, their former laws and law courts . . . . . and have nothing in their laws or courts in common with the rest of Prussia; suffered no revival or intrusion of the old feudal or the Prussian jurisprudence and tribunals, and have very clearly indicated that they would not suffer it. They have shown, in their support of the Catholic bishop of Cologne—arising evidently not from a blind spirit of fanaticism, but from a spirit of opposition to despotic sway—that they are not a population to be governed, like military serfs, by the will or caprice of a cabinet. It is from this population of about 4,000,000 that the impulse has been given to the great movement of the German people in the German league."[2]
>
> "This population, living under French law, *is the very kernel of the Prussian kingdom*—a concentrated population of from three to four millions, *the most wealthy, commercial and manufacturing, and the most enlightened upon their rights and wants, of any, perhaps, in Germany.* In the province of Posen, again, at the other extremity of the kingdom, the French administration, by *justices de paix* and by open courts of justice, and open examination of witnesses, prevails over the general Prussian administration."[3]

That the Prussian Catholics were disposed to range themselves on the side of popular freedom, in consequence of their principles as Catholics, is avowed and proved in the following remarkable passage:

> "The principle that the civil government, or state, or church and state united, of a country is entitled to regulate its religious belief, has more of

---

[1] Pp. 155, and 230–32.

[2] Laing, p. 155.

[3] Laing, pp. 230–31.

intellectual thraldom in it than the power of the popish (?) church ever exercised in the darkest ages; for it had no civil power joined to its religious power. It only worked through the civil power of each country. The church of Rome was an independent, distinct, and often an opposing power in every country to the civil power; A CIRCUMSTANCE IN THE SOCIAL ECONOMY OF THE MIDDLE AGES, TO WHICH, PERHAPS, EUROPE IS INDEBTED FOR HER CIVILIZATION AND FREEDOM—for not being in the state of barbarism and slavery of the east, and of every country, ancient and modern, in which the civil and religious power have been united in one government. Civil liberty is closely connected with religious liberty—with the church being independent of the state. . . . . In Germany the seven Catholic sovereigns have 12,074,700 Catholic subjects, and 2,541,000 Protestant subjects. The twenty-nine Protestant sovereigns, including the four free cities, have 12,113,000 Protestant subjects, and 4,966,000 Catholic. Of these populations in Germany, those which have their point of spiritual government without their states, and independent of them—as the Catholics have at Rome—enjoy certainly more spiritual independence, are less exposed to the intermeddling of the hand of civil power with their religious concerns, than the Protestant populations, which, since the reformation, have had church and state united in one government, and in which each autocratic sovereign is *de facto* a home-pope. The church affairs of Prussia in this half century, those of Saxony, Bavaria, and the smaller principalities, such as Anhalt Kothen, in all of which the state has assumed and exercised power inconsistently with the principles, doctrines, observances, and privileges of the Protestant religion, clearly show that the Protestant church on the continent, as a power, has become an administrative body of clerical functionaries, acting under the orders of the civil power or state."[1]

We must give yet one more passage of a similar import, in which the author acknowledges, with his usual candor, that the German Catholics, in the late controversy regarding mixed marriages, took the liberal side, stood on the most popular ground, and struck a successful blow for liberty:

"The popish (!) priests stand upon the defense of acknowledged spiritual rights, which—if taken away by a royal edict, without any concurrence to it through a constitutional representation, and a law or act to which the people are not parties—would lay open all rights, as well as those claimed by the clergy, to the arbitrary interference of the civil power. Independent altogether of superstition or church influence, the Catholic clergy have here a support from this connexion between their cause and the cause of liberal constitutional government, as opposed to a government of arbitrary edicts and irresponsible functionaries. Between submission to the Pope in all the questions with the Catholic Church, and a representative constitution sanctioning by the voice of the people themselves the supremacy of the state in those questions, no third way is opened to the Prussian government. It seems a decree of fate in social economy, that representative governments, parliaments, shall spring up in every age from collisions between the civil and ecclesiastical powers."[2]

Listen to these avowals of an enlightened and candid Protestant writer. all you who have been crying out for these last three centuries, that all the liberty is on the side of Protestantism, and all the slavery on that of

[1] Laing, p 194.

[2] Laing, p 198.

Catholicity. Listen to them, all you who represent the papacy as the very nucleus of spiritual despotism.

But we must here advert to another very striking feature which existed in the social economy of Prussia up to the beginning of the present century,—a peculiarity which, we believe, was also found until lately in Denmark, and in several other Protestant kingdoms or principalities in the north of Europe. We allude to the feudal or serf-system, which degraded the mass of the population into the veriest slaves that ever drew the breath of life,—slaves who were mere fixtures on the soil, and were bought and sold with it according to the interest or caprice of their masters. This horrible system of thraldom does not, we think, now exist in any European country, except Russia, and Poland,—the poor crushed victim of Russia; it certainly has not existed for centuries in any country where Catholicity was enabled to exercise its influence, untrammeled and uncontrolled. But the genial influence of the Catholic Church, to which society was indebted for the gradual removal of this evil, had been slow to penetrate into the cold regions of northern Europe; it had not penetrated at all into Russia, where the papacy was despised, and its declarations treated with contempt.

Such being the facts of history, be it ever remembered, that Prussia and other Protestant kingdoms of northern Europe actually riveted the bondage of the poor peasantry, and retained, or rather renewed, the degrading serf-system, from the first dawn of the reformation down to the beginning of the present century! At the commencement of the reformation, the German peasants had risen in mass, and had struck for their civil and political rights. The German princes, at the instigation of Luther himself, and of the other principal reformers, had crushed their revolt by main force, and had drowned their cries for liberty in their blood! For almost three centuries from that date, the condition of the peasants was worse than it had ever been before; and the reformation, which talked so much about its love of human liberty, and inveighed so loudly against the enslaving tyranny of Rome, actually kept the mass of its own followers, for almost three centuries, in the most galling and degrading of all servitudes! That such is the fact, will appear from the following testimony of Mr. Laing:

> "If the serf deserted, he was brought back by the military, who patrolled the roads for the purpose of preventing the escape of the peasants into the free towns, their only secure asylum; and was imprisoned, fed on bread and water in the black hole, which existed on every baronial estate, and flogged. The condition of these born serfs was very similar to that of the negro slaves on the West India estates during the apprenticeship term, before their final emancipation. *This system was in full vigor up to the beginning of the present century,* and not merely in remote unfrequented corners of the continent, but in the center of her civilization, all around Hamburg and Lubeck, for instance, in Holstein, Schleswig, Hanover, Brunswick, and over all Prussia."[1]

---

[1] Page 104.

Our readers may now perceive, who have been the real friends of the poor, and the true champions of human liberty,— the Protestants or the Catholics. While the former have talked and boasted much, they have really effected little, or rather their actions have but too often sadly belied their professions. The latter, on the contrary, have said little, but have done much. And the result of these two opposite lines of conduct is plainly traceable in the present condition of the poor—the bulk of the population— in most Catholic and Protestant countries of Europe.

We have yet much more to say on this most interesting subject; we have still to speak of the social condition of Northern Europe, Switzerland, and Italy; and we have to institute a comparison between Catholic and Protestant countries in regard to the moral and religious conditions of their respective populations. But we must defer the treatment of these topics to our next paper.

XXVI. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.*

ARTICLE II.—GERMANY AND ITALY.

The Catholic and Protestant cantons of Switzerland—An "enlightened self-interest"—Why the Protestant cantons are more prosperous—Material condition of Catholic Italy—Italian and Scotch holy days—Mr. Laing's theory for explaining the alleged social inferiority of the Italians—Italy in ancient and modern times—Influence of climate on popular industry and activity—The Italian poor compared with those of England and Ireland—Mr. Laing's testimony—The garden-like culture of Italy—Comparative cheerfulness of Protestant and Catholic nations—Taste for the fine arts—Politeness—Temperance—Testimony of Robert Dale Owen—Comparative morality—Moral condition of Sweden—Popular education in Catholic and Protestant countries—The common school system in Austria—Liberal policy—Relative instruction of English and Belgian operatives—The Prussian common school system—Religious condition—State of religion at Geneva—Deplorable defection—Protestantism in other European countries—Mr. Laing's theory to account for the admitted religious superiority of Catholic nations examined—His honorable testimony to Catholic faith and piety.

THE twenty-two cantons, composing the Swiss confederation, are nearly equally divided between Catholics and Protestants. Mr. Laing gives us the following view of the comparative religious and social condition of these two classes of the population:

"The Swiss people present to the political philosopher the unexpected and most remarkable social phenomenon of a people eminently moral in conduct, yet eminently irreligious; at the head of the moral states of Europe, not merely for absence of numerous or great crimes, or of disregard of right, but for ready obedience to law, for honesty, fidelity to their engagements, for fair dealing, sobriety, and industry, orderly conduct, for good government, useful public institutions, general well-being and comfort—yet at the bottom of the scale for religious feelings, observances, or knowledge, especially in the Protestant cantons, in which prosperity, well-being, and morality, seem to be, as compared to the Catholic cantons, in an inverse ratio to the influence of religion on the people. How is this discordance between their religious and their moral and material state to be reconciled? It is so obvious, that every traveler in Switzerland is struck with the great contrast in the well-being and material condition of the Protestant and Catholic populations, and equally so with the difference in the influence of religion over each. This influence is at its minimum in Protestant, and at its maximum nearly, in Catholic Switzerland; and the prosperity and social well-being of the people are exactly the reverse."[1]

In attempting to explain this "remarkable social phenomenon," Mr. Laing suggests that, in the Protestant cantons, as among the ancient pagan

---

* *Notes of a Traveler on the Social and Political State of France, Prussia, Switzerland Italy, and other parts of Europe, during the present century.* By Samuel Laing, Esq. author of "A Journal of a Residence in Norway," and a "Tour in Sweden." From the second London edition. Philadelphia: Carey & Hart, 1846. 1 vol. 8 vo.

[1] Pp. 304—5.

Romans, "an enlightened self-interest" is made to supply the place of religious influence; and that the Protestant Swiss are moral, honest, and industrious, merely, or chiefly, because it is their interest to be so;[1] according to the old proverb — honesty is the best policy. Be this as it may, we consider his testimony rather favorable than otherwise to the Catholic cantons. If less prosperous in the things of this world, they are, according to our author, much more religious than their Protestant neighbors. The greater prosperity and material well-being of the latter are certainly not the results of any influence of the Protestant religion; for they have little or no religion of any kind to boast of, and religious influence is for them weaker than any other. So also the comparative poverty and unthriftiness of the Catholic cantons cannot be fairly ascribed to the influence of their religion; for this has obviously no tendency whatever, either in its principles or its practices, to produce any such effects. Taking the facts as stated by Mr. Laing, and admitting the correctness of his own explanation of them, it would only follow that the Protestant cantons are more thrifty, because they are more alive to their own interest, and more thoroughly selfish, than the Catholic: a circumstance not at all to their credit. It amounts precisely to what we had occasion to observe in a previous paper; that the Protestant principle of private judgment tends to isolate from the rest of society those who profess it, and to foster in them a spirit of individualism, of pride, and of avarice. It may make them more wealthy and more devoted to this world; it will not render them more amiable, more charitable, or better members of society.

If Mr. Laing had written after the late disturbances in Switzerland, — disturbances originated and carried on by the lawless radicalism and turbulence of the Protestant cantons, — we think he would have somewhat altered his opinion about the ready obedience to law, the honesty and fair dealing of the Protestant Swiss. At any rate, he might have found a much more plausible explanation for the alleged difference in material well-being of the Catholic and Protestant cantons. It surely could not have escaped his acute observation, that the latter embrace the valleys and the richest portion of Switzerland; while the former are principally confined to the mountainous, and more barren districts. This circumstance would alone explain the phenomenon alluded to, without having recourse to the difference in religious influence. Take two populations equally industrious and equally enterprising; place one in a mountainous country where the soil is thin and ungrateful, and the latter in rich and fertile valleys where nature is much more bountiful, and every one will readily understand that, in less than half a century, the former will become much more wealthy and prosperous than the latter. This is, to a great extent, the case with the Protestant and Catholic cantons. While the inhabitants of the mountainous region have remained steadfast in their allegiance to the faith of their forefathers, — to the faith of William

---

[1] Pp. 304–5.

Tell, of Fürst, and of Melchtal,—those of the plains, more wealthy and more attached to this world, have abandoned Catholicity and embraced Protestantism. And not only have they the advantage of position in regard to agriculture, but they have superior commercial and manufacturing facilities. They have, in fact, almost monopolized the trade and the manufactures of Switzerland. Having all these advantages, and being moreover wholly devoted to the things of this world, —being, in reality, as Mr. Laing proves, practically infidels, —can we wonder that they are more prosperous than their neighbors, the hardy Catholic mountaineers? They seek this world, and forget the world to come; Providence has punished them by awarding to them the things of this world; and THEY HAVE RECEIVED THEIR REWARD! Who envies them their condition? What generous Christian spirit is there that would not prefer the humbler state of the Catholic cantons?

Come we next to Italy, the alleged social inferiority, poverty, and political degradation of which, notwithstanding the richness of its soil and the beauty of its climate, are ascribed, by most Protestant writers on political and social economy, to its bad governments and its profession of the Catholic religion. Mr. Laing, we are happy to perceive, is much more just to the Italians than the common herd of writers to whom we have alluded. He thinks, indeed, that the Italian population is far behind the English in social well-being and in the comforts of civilized life; but he ascribes the difference to the circumstances of climate, soil, fertility, commercial facilities, and to others of a similar character. Upon the fact itself, as stated, or rather assumed, we may have something to say in the sequel; for the present we will lay before our readers Mr. Laing's explanation of it. He writes:

> "To what can this difference be ascribed? Italy was far advanced—as far in many points as she is at this day—before England had started in the course of civilization; and when Scotland was in a state of gross barbarism. The Englishman ascribes this to the want of constitutional government; the Scotchman to the want of pure religious doctrine. The government and religion of a foreign country are two very convenient packhorses for the travelers. They trot along the road with him, carrying all that he cannot otherwise conveniently dispose of, and the prejudices of his readers prevent any doubt of the burden being laid upon the right beast. But, in reality, no government of the present day, no matter what be its form, is so ignorant of sound principles, so blind to its own interests, and so impregnable to public opinion, as willfully to keep back, discourage, or attempt to put down industry and civilization. It is in the means they use, not in the end they propose, that modern governments, whether despotically or liberally constituted, differ from each other," &c.[1]

In answer to the charge, that the number of holydays kept in Italian and other Catholic countries greatly interferes with the industry, and thereby diminishes the wealth of the people, he maintains that, in England, and especially in Scotland, there are, in reality, more holydays than in Italy itself:

---

[1] Pages 433-4.

"As to religion, the popish (!) practically interferes less with the time and industry of the people than the Presbyterian. . . . . In Scotland, if we reckon the occasional fast-days, proclaimed by the church; the preparation days for the sacrament; and the many half days devoted to religious meetings, prayer meetings, church meetings, missionary society meetings, Bible society meetings, and all the other social duties connected with the religious position and sentiments of the individual, it will be found, as it ought to be found, that out of the three hundred and sixty-five days, the pious, well conducted Presbyterian tradesman, workman, or respectable middle-class man in Scotland bestows, in the present times, many more working hours in the year upon religious concerns than the papist in Italy. It is an inconsistency to ascribe to the loss of time, by their religious observances, the poverty and idleness of the population of the south of Europe, when we see the time abstracted among ourselves from the pursuits of industry for religious purposes, although little, if at all, less in amount, producing no such impoverishing or prejudicial effects; but, on the contrary, evidently invigorating the industry of the people, and contributing essentially to their morality and civilization."

Having disposed of these two fashionable methods of accounting for the alleged inferiority of Italy,— her religion and government,— Mr. Laing proceeds to give us his own theory on the subject, a theory which he confirms by plausible, if not conclusive arguments. He says:

"It is, in truth, neither the bad government, nor the bad religion of Italy, which keeps her behind the other countries of Europe. The blessings of Italy are her curse. Fine soil and climate, and an almost equal abundance of production over all the land, render each man too independent of the industry of his fellow-man. Italy has not, like all other countries which have attained to any considerable and permanent state of general civilization and industry, one portion of her population depending, from natural causes, upon another portion for necessary articles — no highland and lowland, no inland nor sea-coast populations producing different necessaries of life, and exchanging with each other industry for industry — no wine-growing population, and corn-growing population, as in France, depending upon each other's production — no mining population, sea-faring population, manufacturing population, distinct from agricultural population and production. She has no natural division of her social body into growers and consumers, because every inhabitable corner of the peninsula grows almost the same kind of products, corn, wine, oil, silk, fruits; and every consumer is a producer, and there is no natural capability in the country of raising an artificial division in its population by trade and manufacture. The great source of industry and civilization in France is the cultivation of the vine, and its natural exclusion from all the north of France. It is the greatest manufacture in the world. . . . . . Italy has not this advantage. With her equal, or nearly equal productiveness of soil and climate over all, both in the kinds and quantities of her products, no considerable masses of her population are depending upon each other's industry for the supply of their mutual wants, and inseparably bound up with each other by common interests. . . There is little command of water power, and none of fire power, in the Italian peninsula, for moving machinery. The Po, the Adige, the Ticino, and all the Alpine rivers; the Tiber, the Arno, and all from the Appennines, owing to the melting of the snow at their main sources, partake of the character of mountain streams, having such

---

1 Pages 434-5.

difference of level at different seasons, that mill-seats on their banks, at which water-power can be always available, are extremely rare. The corn mills on those rivers are constructed on rafts or boats anchored in the stream, so as to rise and fall with the increase or decrease of the water. Italy also, notwithstanding her vast extent of sea-coast, is badly situated for commercial industry, or supporting a sea-faring population. She has little coasting trade, because all parts of her territory produce nearly the same articles in sufficient abundance for the inhabitants, and has little trade, for the same reason, with the other countries on the Mediterranean. Her sea-coast also is, in general, uninhabitable from malaria; so that no great mass of population, deriving the means of living from commercial industry, and distinct from the inland population, can ever be formed. Cities and towns are, no doubt, numerous in Italy, and, perhaps, so many masses of population of from fifty to sixty thousand persons, down to two or three thousand, cannot be found anywhere else in Europe, within so small an area, as in the plains of this peninsula. But these cities and towns are of a very peculiar character. The country is so fertile, that each of those masses of population draws its subsistence from, and extends its influence over, a very small circle beyond its own town walls. All capital, industry, intelligence, civil authority, and business, public and private; all trade, manufacture, or consumption of the objects of trade and manufacture, and, it may be said, all civilization, are centralized within these cities, and the small circles of country around them from which they draw their consumption. . . . . Each city or town, within its own circle, suffices for itself, is a Metayer family upon a great scale living upon its own farm, and having no dependence upon, or connection with,. the industry, interests, prosperity, or business of its neighbors in the land; and very little communication or traffic with any other masses of population, by carriers, wagons, carts, diligences, or water conveyance, the objects of interchange being, from the general bounty of nature, but very few between them."[1]

We have been somewhat copious in our extracts, because we wished to exhibit, in his own words, a correct outline of Mr. Laing's theory to account for the alleged inferiority of Italy in her material condition. According to this theory, which imbodies much accurate and solid information on the actual state of the Italian peninsula, there are causes abundantly to account for the inferiority, wholly independent of either government or religion. These causes, as we understand them, are, n brief, as follows: a fertile soil producing with exuberance the necessaries of life, without much labor in the agriculturist, whose industry is, therefore, not much called forth; the nearly equal productiveness of the land over the whole of her territory, both as to the quantity and the quality of the articles produced, thereby rendering the exchange of commodities among different portions of her population, in a great measure, unnecessary; the almost total absence of water-power and of other facilities for manufactures; the general insalubrity of her widely extended sea-coast, rendering a sea-faring life hazardous, and cutting off the right arm of her commerce; finally, a system of centralization, more or less general, making all the capitals and larger towns nearly independent of one another, because they need not go much beyond their own gates to obtain all their necessary supplies: these are the principal reasons alleged by our author to explain the alleged inferior condition of the Italian population. These causes, clearly founded in fact, would, it must be admitted, explain the alleged phenomenon, no matter what the religion, or what the government of Italy.

---

[1] Pages 435-37.

We may be told, that the material condition of Italy was not always as low as it is at the present day; that, not to go back to the time of the ancient Romans, the central and northern Italians were, during the middle ages, the most active and commercial people in the world; and that if Italy, instead of being cut up into a number of petty principalities, governed by absolute sovereigns, were now again united in one great state under one good government, she might be again what she once was in ancient times and during the middle ages.

We may be wrong, but we greatly doubt whether this union of the whole Italian peninsula, under one government, would be useful or expedient, even if it were practicable. The dispositions and characters of the the inhabitants are so very different in the north, center, and south of Italy, that we greatly doubt whether they could be united politically into one nation, unless on the principle of a confederation, as in Switzerland and the United States; and even this would be open to serious objections. Besides, would this destroy, or even diminish the force of the circumstances above alleged by Mr. Laing? Would it render the soil less productive, or more varied in its products? Would it make the sea-coast more healthy, or create new manufacturing or commercial facilities? Would it do away with that system of agricultural and commercial centralization which has grown so naturally out of the situation and exigencies of the country? We believe not.

The northern and central Italians were, indeed, some centuries ago, the most enterprising and active traders of Europe; the Venetians and the Genoese, the Florentines and the Pisans were the commercial carriers of the civilized world. But the condition of things has wholly changed since that period. Commerce is no longer confined to the Mediterranean and Baltic seas; it has stretched out its gigantic arms to new worlds in the far east and the far west, undreamed of by the busy merchants of the middle ages; and the natural result has been a total revolution in the state of commerce. Trade has passed into other and deeper channels; and the new commercial adventurers have supplanted the old pioneers of commerce, even in the Mediterranean itself. As to the agricultural and commercial condition of Italy under the iron sway of the ancient Romans, one fact alone would prove that it was greatly inferior to what it is at present; the Romans were compelled to draw their supplies from all parts of the world, and were even thus often straitened for the necessaries or luxuries of life; whereas at present Italy suffices for itself, having a sufficient surplus in her own rich and exuberant products to give in exchange for those luxuries of which she is in want. Besides, Italian soil is now cultivated by freemen, whose cheerfully bestowed labor fully brings out its abundant resources, which are, besides, usually consumed on the spot; under the ancient Romans, the land was cultivated by miserable slaves, who worked, trembling under the lash, and the fruits of whose labor often went to increase the luxuries of their cruel taskmasters at Rome.

There is one circumstance to which Mr. Laing has not adverted, or to which he has at least given but little importance, but which should not have been omitted in this investigation: the influence of climate on the comparative industry and activity of a people. There is no doubt that a warm climate tends greatly to enervate the system, and to indispose it for active labor; and that, on the contrary, a cold climate gives elasticity to the frame, and renders bodily exertion congenial, healthy, and even agreeable. Providence has accordingly wisely ordained, that southern regions should be naturally more fertile and productive, and that those lying in more northern latitudes should generally require more labor to develop their resources. Is it any fault of the Italians, that their exuberant soil should produce the necessaries of life with half the labor requisite for the same purpose in less genial countries? Are they to be set down at once as idle and slothful, if, unlike their less favored northern neighbors, they have occasionally more leisure on their hands, after the necessary labor of the season? Are they to be censured as lazy drones in society, if, content with the necessaries of life, they are not goaded on continually by the stimulus of avarice, to accumulate overgrown fortunes by ceaseless labor and solicitude for this world's goods? We think not.

It sounds well to talk of the industry and enterprise of a people, and of the comforts they gather around themselves as the fruits of long continued labor. But if we look a little more closely into the matter, and find that, as is but too often the case in England, the poor operative may toil from morning till night during all the days of a hard life, probably shortened by excessive labor and exposure; if we find, moreover, that, with all this weary labor, he is scarcely able to procure the bare necessaries of life for himself and family; and that, at the end of his mortal career, he is no more wealthy than he was at its commencement, his hard earnings having, to a great extent, gone into the pockets of an unfeeling capitalist; then the charm of all this much eulogized industry vanishes at once, and we are almost disposed to envy the comparative indolence of the Italian. The proverbial *dolce far niente* of the latter, is certainly preferable, in this state of the case, to the never-ending labor of the former.

And if we extend our view a little farther, and look into the miserable hovels of the Irish laborers—the great mass of the Irish population;—their poor and scanty food, often wholly insufficient to sustain life itself; their children crying aloud for bread or potatoes, which the agony-stricken parent, with all his hard and ceaseless toil, is not able to bestow; and when we reflect that all this misery is the natural result of that heartless and griping avarice which is for ever crying out to the poor—work! work! work!: we are tempted to execrate a system so utterly at variance with the dictates of humanity,—a system which fattens on the weary labor of the poor, and makes the wealth of a nation compatible with the misery, verging even on the starvation, of the great mass of its population. Better far have a people less industrious, less commercial, and less enterprising, and, at the same time, less avaricious and less laborious, and withal better clothed, better fed, and more happy.

What calm and impartial observer will say, that the mass of the Italian population is a whit worse off than that of Ireland, or even that of Scotland or England? Laying all prejudice aside, and looking into things as they really are, we cannot fail to come to the conclusion, that the laboring class in Italy is as well fed, and as well clothed, as the similar class in Scotland or England itself; and, at the same time, much more cheerful and happy in their humble condition: while between their state and that of the poor crushed and starving Irish operatives there is no comparison whatever. Few are the Italian laborers who have not a sufficiency of bread, wine, oil, and cheese, throughout the year. These articles may, indeed, be of inferior quality; but they suffice to appease hunger, and the people are satisfied with them. Even the poor beggar is not generally destitute of these necessaries or luxuries of life; and instances of downright starvation in Italy are very rare indeed. The Italian peasant may not have the luxury of meat as often as the English laborer; but he has it as often at least as the Irish, and besides he is content to do without it. His climate does not require so gross or so abundant a food as does one farther north; and he can therefore afford to be content with less. He may not, indeed, be so free, in a political point of view, as his English brother, and he may not boast so much about his political rights; but, withal, he is as content with his lot. He is in a condition of political thraldom, generally of a mild and paternal character, which does not at least tantalize him with the vision of a freedom beyond his reach; the English laborer, politically free and boasting of his rights as a freemen, is often, in reality, bound by much more galling chains of servitude. Money and capital are more exacting and cruel task-masters than the worst political despotism. It is not those who talk most of liberty, who are in reality the freest.

Let us see what Mr. Laing himself says on this subject. Speaking of the Tuscan population about Florence, he remarks:

> "Without, within, and around the gates of Florence, you hear on all sides the busy hum of men. The suburbs of small houses, the clusters of good, clean, tradesmen-like habitations, extend a mile or two. Shops, wine houses, market carts, country people, smart peasant girls, gardeners, weavers, wheelrights, hucksters, in short, all the ordinary suburban trades and occupations which usually locate themselves in the outskirts of thriving cities, are in full movement here. The laboring class in Florence are well lodged; and from the number and contents of the provision stalls in the obscure, third rate streets, the number of butcher's shops, grocers' shops, eating houses, the coffee-house for the middle and lower classes, the traveler must conclude that they are generally well fed and at their ease. The laborer is whistling at his work, the weaver singing over his loom."[1]

---

[1] Page 418.

Referring to the famous Tuscan valley of the Arno, he bears the following flattering testimony to its agricultural condition, as compared to that of the most favored districts in England or Scotland:

> "Scotland, or England, can produce no one tract of land to be compared to this strath of the Arno, not to say for productiveness, because that depends on the soil and climate, which we have not of similar quality to compare, but for industry and intelligence applied to husbandry, for perfect drainage, for irrigation, for garden-like culture, for clean state of crops, for absence of all waste of land, labor, or manure; for good cultivation, and the good condition of the laboring cultivator. These are points which admit of being compared between one farm and another, in the most distant soils and, climates. Our system of large farms will gain nothing in such a comparison with the husbandry of Tuscany, Flanders, or Switzerland, under a system of small farms."[1]

He ascribes the garden-like culture of Tuscany to the system of small proprietorship, as he does the inferior cultivation of the papal and Neapolitan states to that of large landed estates, on which husbandry is not attended to in such detail. He commends the Roman Pontiffs for their zeal in draining the Pontine Marshes, the natural situation of which will not, however, admit of perfect drainage.[2] Another drawback on the agriculture of the papal states is, the existence of that widely extended, uninhabitable, and, to a great extent, uncultivable Maremna district, which the papal government had surely no hand in creating, or rendering barren and desolate.[3] Out of this district, along the borders of the Adriatic Sea, in the vicinity of Bologna and Ancona, the agricultural condition of the country might be well compared with that of England itself; to say nothing of the beautiful and highly cultivated plains of Lombardy.

No one who has at all glanced at the relative condition of the Protestant and Catholic populations of Europe, or at that of its northern and southern inhabitants, can fail to have remarked the superior cheerfulness of the latter. This trait lies on the surface, and it is as prominent as it is characteristic. While the northern Protestant is, in general, as serious and gloomy, as his own climate; the southern Catholic is as lively and cheerful, as his own beautiful fields and bright skies. Is this the result of climate or of religion? We believe it is the effect of both combined. The Catholic religion is much more cheerful than any of the numerous Protestant sects. It has its stated popular feasts and church holydays, and it encourages a spirit of innocent hilarity among its people. It does not measure a man's religion by the length of his face; but, on the contrary, estimates it by the amount of his good deeds, and of his cheerfulness in bestowing charity, and in doing his duty to God and man. If we except a portion of Germany, in which the old Catholic cheerfulness of the population has been proof against the gloomy influences of Protestantism, we know of no Protestant country that has any innocent popular amusement worth speaking of. Theaters, horse races, boxing matches, cock fights; these are, indeed, found in abundance; but are they innocent, or do they contribute to the cheerfulness of the people? Does not the spirit of avarice—to say nothing of drunkenness, quarreling, and other vices equally ruinous—usually preside over them all; and is not amusement but too often made subservient to mere money-making? Where are the religious holydays and popular festivals which once gladdened the hearts of Englishmen, and gave to England the title of "merry,"—a title that she can no longer wear with propriety? All gone, swept away by the gloomy tendency of a *new* religion, and by the breath of a mammonism, the cardinal maxim of which is—*time is money*. Where will you find in Protestant regions those frequent and vast assemblages of the common people, commingling in cheerful social intercourse on the green lawn, or in public walks laid out in each city for this purpose? Such places of public amusement exist in almost all the cities of southern Europe; but few of them are to be found in the north, and even these become places for display, theaters for the splendid equipages of the rich, rather than public property, and places of free and general resort for the people of all classes and grades of society.

---

[1] Page 420.

[2] Page 368.

[3] Page 376, seqq.

Closely connected with this habitual cheerfulness of the Italians, is a generally diffused taste for the fine arts; for music, painting, sculpture and architecture. This may be said to be a characteristic trait of the popular mind in Italy, which is, even now, avowedly the principal seat of the fine arts. Next to Italy, in this respect, comes Catholic Bavaria, under the auspices of her enlightened government; but Bavaria caught the spirit from Italy. Mr. Laing freely admits that, "a single town in Italy or Germany could produce more show-edifices, more costly palaces, more museums, picture galleries, and music saloons, than half the Island of Great Britain."[1] He likewise asserts it as "undeniable, that in the character of the people of Britain, even of the higher classes, there is no feeling for the fine arts, no foundation for them, no esteem for them."[2] And though he believes that this sad want of taste is no disparagement to the British character, and that it is, on the contrary, rather an evidence of a practical good sense, which prefers in all things the useful to the beautiful and agreeable, and would fain turn every thing into gold, yet we beg leave to differ widely from him in opinion on the subject. We cannot subscribe to that heartless utilitarianism, which would ruthlessly immolate every object of taste on the altar of mammon, and would denounce, as a waste of money, every expenditure not made according to the principles of reproductive industry, so much commended by our author. With all due deference to his judgment, we could not consent to have the statues of Michael Angelo, Raphael, and Canova, taken down from the niche of fame, to be replaced by those of Arkwright, Watt, and Davy.[3] The useful and the fine arts are not incompatible, and might easily be cultivated together by the same people. The cultivation of a taste for the fine arts tends greatly to humanize a people, to develop the finer feelings of our nature, and greatly to refine popular manners.

---

[1] Page 442. [2] Ibid. [3] Such would seem to be Mr. Laing's aspiration. See p 45.

Accordingly, we find that the Italians are far in advance of the English in politeness, by which we mean not merely the forms of courtesy in social intercourse, but that habitual respect for the opinions and feelings of others, manifested both in word and deed, which distinguishes a highly refined and polished society from one that is rude and uncouth. The Italians, like the French, are remarkable for their universal politeness, particularly towards strangers. Nor is this trait of character confined to the higher and more educated classes; it is common also to the lowest, and even to children. We have often heard and read of the rudeness and vulgarity of an English crowd, drawn together by curiosity on occasions of public rejoicing or excitement. How strong the contrast between their conduct on such occasions, and that of a late Italian assemblage at Venice, on a festival in honor of a beloved parish priest having reached the fiftieth year of his ministry! Mr. Laing was present on this occasion, on which the whole Venitian population seems to have turned out; and, after describing the scene, he tells us, that

> "In all this bustle, I did not see, even in the fish market at the Rialto, a single instance of intoxication — people were not drinking, although all were singing, talking, and enjoying themselves — nor a single instance, *even among the boys*, of jostling, pushing, running, or rudeness, nor a single person whom I could suppose to be a policeman. The ordinary corporal's guard, at a public building near the church, was the only authority I saw of any kind."[1]

He furnishes similar testimony in regard to the refinement and politeness of the lower orders in Florence:

> "No town on the continent," he says, "shows so much of this kind of intellectuality (a taste for the fine arts), or so much well-being and good conduct among the people. It happened that the 9th of May was kept here as a great holyday by the lower class, as May-day with us, and they assembled in a kind of park about a mile from the city, where booths, tents, and carts with wine and eatables for sale, were in crowds and clusters, as at our village wakes and race-courses. The multitude from town and country round could not be less than twenty thousand people, grouped in small parties, dancing, singing, talking, dining on the grass, and enjoying themselves. *I did not see a single instance of inebriety, ill-temper, or unruly boisterous conduct;* yet the people were gay and joyous. There was no police, except at the crossings of the alley in the park, a mounted dragoon to make the innumerable carts, horses, and carriages of all kinds and classes keep their files and their own sides of the road. The scene gave a favorable impression of the state of the lower classes in Tuscany."[2]

Such exhibitions speak volumes for the moral training and habitual politeness of a people. Drunkenness, in fact, as well as rudeness or coarseness of manners, are almost unknown in southern Europe. They seem to be almost distinctive traits in the character of certain northern nations, who yet boast of their superior refinement, and take it upon themselves to sneer at the people of Catholic countries farther south! In a recent letter from Naples, Robert Dale Owen writes as follows:

---

[1] Page 428.

[2] Pages 418-19.

"I have not seen a man even partially intoxicated since I have been in the city, of 420,000 inhabitants, and they say one may live here for four years without seeing one. All drink light wines; and I am not at all sure if Longworth, the Cincinnati patron of vineyards, is not doing more in our country for temperance, than any temperance lecturer in it."

Nor is this the only thing, in which the morality of Italy and other Catholic countries is purer and more elevated than that of northern nations professing Protestantism. Singular as it may appear to those who are forever boasting of the superior moral tendency of Protestantism, it is a fact openly avowed and clearly established by Mr. Laing, himself a Protestant, that these northern nations, particularly Sweden and Prussia, in spite of the coldness of the climate, and the consequent colder temperament of the people, are decidedly the most impure and unchaste in the whole range of the civilized world! We cannot make room in this place for his full testimony and his abundant statistical facts on the subject; nor is it deemed necessary, as they have been already frequently quoted in this country, and are more or less familiar to our readers. Suffice it to say, that a long preface of thirty pages, prefixed to the present American edition of his "Notes," is devoted to a triumphant vindication of his previous statements, in a former edition, in regard to the low state of morals in Sweden. He here establishes, from undoubted statistical returns, that in Stockholm, the Swedish capital, there is one illegitimate birth, to every one and a half that are legitimate![1]

We will present here a brief analysis of his testimony:

"It is a singular and embarrassing fact that the Swedish nation, isolated from the mass of European people, and almost entirely agricultural or pastoral, having, in about three millions of individuals, only 14,925 employed in manufactories, and these not congregated in one or two places, but scattered among 2,037 factories, having no great standing army or navy, no external commerce, no afflux of strangers, no considerable city but one, and having schools and universities in a fair proportion, and a powerful and complete church establishment, undisturbed in its labors by sect or schism, is notwithstanding *in a more demoralized state than any other nation in Europe*, — more demoralized even than any equal portion of the dense manufacturing population of Great Britain. This is a very curious fact in moral statistics."[2]

To establish this fact, he produces the strongest evidence from authentic statistical tables. In 1837, 26,275 were under prosecution for criminal offenses in Sweden, of whom 21,262 were convicted; being one to every one hundred and forty of the entire population. In 1836, the number convicted of heinous crimes was still greater, being in proportion of one to one hundred and thirty-four of the whole population. Among the heinous crimes, figure murder, child murder, poisoning, robbery, and bestiality! In order to understand the awful extent of crime in this thoroughly Protestant country, it is enough to state, that the amount of crime there is seven-fold greater than even in England, which is surely bad enough! In England, the proportion which the number convicted of crime bears to the total population, is as 1 to 1005.

---

[1] Page 25.

[2] "A Tour in Sweden in 1828;" London, 1839. Noticed by the Dublin Review, May 1842.

The most thoroughly immoral city in the world is Stockholm, the capital of Sweden. In all Sweden the proportion of illegitimate to legitimate children is as one to fourteen; in the capitol, it was in 1837, as one to two and three-tenths!![1] When this startling revelation made by Mr. Laing appeared, the Swedish legation in London attempted its refutation in an elaborate pamphlet. This provoked a rejoinder from Laing, who triumphantly proved all his previous statements, by unanswerable statistics. He proved, that in 1838, "the divorces were 147, the suicides 172. Of the 2,714 children born in Stockholm, 1,577 were legitimate, 1,137 illegitimate; making only a balance of 440 chaste mothers out of 2,714; and the proportion of illegitimate to legitimate children, not as one to two and three-tenths, but as ONE TO ONE AND A HALF!!"[2]

In regard to Prussia, he asserts that chastity, the "index-virtue of the moral condition of a people, is lower than in almost any part of Europe."[3] In proof of this, he adds:

> "It is no uncommon event in the family of a respectable tradesman in Berlin to find on his breakfast table a little baby, of which, whoever may be the father, he has no doubt at all about the maternal grandfather. Such accidents are so common in the class in which they are least common with us—the middle class removed from ignorance or indigence—that they are regarded but as accidents, as youthful indiscretions, not as disgraces, affecting, as with us, the respectability and happiness of all the kith and kid for a generation."[4]

The worst enemy of Italy could not assert so much as this, in regard to the state of Italian morals.

Mr. Laing has bestowed much research on the interesting subject of popular education in the various nations of Europe; and, zealous Protestant though he be, truth compelled him to award the palm of pre-eminence to Catholic countries. The following extract, exhibiting the result of his inquiries on the subject, will probably startle those, who have been led to believe that naught but darkness and superstition could come of Catholicity:

> "In Catholic Germany, in France, and even in Italy, the education of the common people, in reading, writing, arithmetic, music, manners, and morals, is at least as generally diffused, and as faithfully promoted by the clerical body, as in Scotland. It is by their own advance, and not by keeping back the advance of the people, that the popish priesthood of the present day seek to keep ahead of the intellectual progress of the community in Catholic lands: and they might, perhaps, retort on our Presbyterian clergy, and ask, if they too are in their countries at the head of the intellectual movement of the age? Education is in reality not only not repressed, but is encouraged by the popish church; and is a mighty instrument in its hands, and ably used. In every street in Rome, for instance, there are, at short distances, public primary schools, for the education of the children of the lower and middle classes in the neighborhood. Rome, with a population of 158,678 souls, has 372 public

---

[1] Laing, Ibid [2] Ibid. [3] P. 173. [4] Ibid.

primary schools, with 482 teachers, and 14,000 children attending them. Has Edinburg so many schools for the instruction of those classes? I doubt it. Berlin, with a population about double that of Rome, has only 264 schools. Rome has also her university, with an average attendance of 660 students: and the Papal States, with a population of two and a half millions, contain seven universities. Prussia, with a population of fourteen millions, has but seven."

Austria is generally represented as among the most despotic governments in Europe, or in the world. We have no mission to defend her policy. We have always detested tyranny wherever it was found; but we doubt not, that much of the obloquy which has been, of late years, so freely poured out upon this government, has originated in the fact that more than three-fourths of the Austrian people are Catholics. However, with all the alleged tyranny of this vast Catholic majority, having full control of the government, are the civil or religious rights of the Protestant minority violated or infringed? Not at all. The Protestants have there, not only perfect freedom of worship, but also their *separate schools;* though in Austria, as elsewhere, there is a government system of common schools. Thus, in despotic Austria the Protestants are generally granted a privilege which, in this free and enlightened country, is positively and sternly denied to the small Catholic minority by the overwhelming Protestant majority of our citizens! This is one out of a hundred instances which might be alleged, to show the difference between the theory and practice of liberty among those who profess to be its warmest advocates. Let the Protestant majority in this country do for the Catholics what tyrannical Catholic Austria is doing for her Protestant citizens; and then they may, with some appearance of consistency, indulge in railings against Austrian despotism!

For the assertion above made in regard to Austrian liberality, we allege the most respectable Protestant authority, that of *Joseph Kay*, Esq., in a work recently published in England on education, and dedicated to Lord John Russell.[1] He says:

"The most interesting and satisfactory feature of the Austrian system is the great liberality with which the government, although so staunch an adherent and supporter of the Romanist priesthood, has treated the religious parties who differ from itself in their religious dogmas. It has been entirely owing to this liberality, that neither the great number of the sects in Austria, nor the great difference of their religious tenets, has hindered the work of the education of the poor throughout the empire. Here, as elsewhere, it has been demonstrated that such difficulties may easily be overcome, when a government understands how to raise the nation in civilization, and *wishes earnestly to do so.*

"In those parishes of the Austrian Empire, where there are any dissenters from the Romanist Church, the education of their children is not directed by the priest, but is committed to the care of the dissenting ministers. These latter are empowered and required by government to provide for, to watch over, and to promote the education of the children of their own sects, in the same manner as the priests are required to do for the education of Catholic children.

---

[1] The work is entitled: The Social Condition and Education of the people in England and Europe; by Joseph Kay, Esq., M. A., of the Inner Temple, &c."

> "In each county a dissenting minister is chosen by the magistrates, as the general superintendent and inspector of the education of all the dissenters of his county. This minister, accompanied by one of the county magistrates, is required to visit and inspect the dissenting schools in his county at least once in every year, and to report thereon. He is also required and empowered to enforce the building of schools in districts inhabited by dissenters alone, but unsupplied with schools; to oblige all the dissenters to send their children to some school or to educate them efficiently at home; to *take care that the children of dissenters who attend Romanist schools* receive regular religious instruction from some minister of their own sect."

We must be permitted to present another Protestant authority, to show the relative condition, in the matter of education and morals, of the laborers in the mining districts of Catholic Belgium and Protestant England. The committee of the council of education has lately laid their Blue Book before the English Parliament. Rev. J. P. Norris, one of the inspectors of schools, surely an unexceptionable witness, reports as follows on the subject just alluded to:

> "In a short tour of inquiry made last autumn through the Belgian coal fields, I found that the miners made up for the poverty of their earlier schooling by attendance at Sunday schools and evening schools, in the interval of their work. Some of these evening schools were especially devoted to the instruction of the *porions* or overmen, in mensuration and other mining sciences; the prizes and certificates are given by the municipal authorities who supported these schools, and their effects was plainly discernible in the intelligence and politeness of those with whom I conversed at their work." "In South Staffordshire," he proceeds to say, "the case is far different. The child who goes down into the pit at ten years old is consigned to darkness, morally as well as physically. I shall not soon lose the painful impression left upon my mind by an examination, by torch-light, of nine collier boys, whom I got together in one of the best ordered pits on the western side of Dudley. Their ages varied from 10 to 15. Six had once attended school, and professed to be able to read; two still attended a Sunday school occasionally. Only one could answer the simplest questions in arithmetic—what would 2s. 6d. or 3s. a day amount to in a week?—how many lbs. in a hundred weight?—how many cwt. there were to a ton? One, with great difficulty, multiplied 28 by 4. On passing from the 'reckoning night' to the office of the great reckoning day, they told me at once that I referred to the last day, when God would judge us all. What would he ask? They appeared to have forgotton the Commandments. Those who had been at school by degrees began to remember something about them, and could say the fifth and eighth when started. None knew how many Gospels there were. I began 'Matthew,' one called 'John;' none could tell all four. How many Apostles? None knew. Which was the wicked one—the traitor? One said 'Peter,' another 'Abraham;' none knew. Throughout my tour in that dark district, the thought of that benighted group of boys, and the almost melancholy expression which the torch-light showed me on the pale faces of the elder men, seemed to follow me, and drive me like a goad."

Mr. Laing has examined the question of common school education in Prussia, in all its bearings; he has devoted three long chapters to its consideration; and he has proved by facts and arguments which are conclusive and unanswerable, that the system is highly injurious and pernicious in its influence on the morals, on the religion, and on the social condition and character of the people; that, instead of raising them up in the scale of social life, it enthralls, debases, and degrades them into mere slaves, wholly devoid of all proper self-respect, and of all intellectual, moral, religious, and political freedom.[1] He has established all this to a demonstration. He has shown, that "the lowest class of the Prussian population are, intellectually, but big children who know their letters;" that "they are in an extreme inertness of mind;"[2] and that they are, with all their pretended learning, immeasurably below the peasantry of many other countries, in which popular education is less generally diffused. They are taught just so much as the government wishes—just enough to make them accomplished slaves; no more.

Our limits will not permit us to give even a condensed analysis of his facts and arguments on this branch of the subject. We must refer those who wish for more extended information to the work itself, or to the notice of it in a recent number of the Dublin Review. We can make room for only one or two extracts:

> "The almost mechanical operations of reading, writing, and reckoning, are unquestionably most valuable acquirements;—who can deny or doubt it? but they are not education: they are the means only, not the end—the tools, not the work—in the education of man. . . ... If the ultimate object of all education and knowledge be to raise man to the feeling of his own moral worth—to a sense of his responsibility to his Creator, and to his conscience for every act—to the dignity of a reflecting, self-guiding, virtuous, religious member of society—then the Prussian educational system is a failure. It is only a training from childhood in the conventional discipline and submission of mind which the state exacts from its subjects. It is not a training or education which has raised, but which has lowered, the human character. This system of interference and intrusion into the inmost domestic relations of the people, this educational drill of every family by state means and machinery, supersedes parental tuition. It is a fact not to be denied, that the Prussian population is at this day, when the fruits of the educational system may be appreciated in the generation of the adults, in a remarkably demoralized condition in those branches of moral conduct which cannot be taught by the parents, because parental tuition is broken in upon by governmental interference in Prussia, its efficacy and weight annulled, and the natural dependence of the child upon the words of wisdom of the parent—the delicate threads by which the infant's mind, as its body, draws nutriment from its parent—is ruptured."[3]
>
> "The Prussians morally are slaves of enslaved minds. Compulsory education, compulsory religion, compulsory military service, and the finger of government interfering in all action and opinion, and leaving nothing to free-will and uncontrolled individual judgment;—produce youths well educated, as it is called, because they can read, write, and sing, well dressed, well drilled, and able-bodied; and whose *selbstgefuhl*,[4] whose moral sense has not been educated, raised, and cultivated, even to the extent of making them feel debased or degraded, at running, cap in hand, begging at the side of carriages on the highway."[5]

---

[1] Laing, chapters vi, vii, viii.

[2] Laing, p. 264.

[3] Laing, pp. 172–3.

[4] Self-respect or esteem.

[5] Laing, p. 176.

We will devote our remaining space to a few remarks and testimonies of Mr. Laing on the relative religious condition of the two classes of countries which we are comparing. In regard to religion, the Catholic populations of Europe occupy the most elevated ground; while the Protestant, on the contrary, have sunk to the lowest depth, and have surely little to boast of. Mr. Laing assures us, for example, that in Prussia the standard of religious faith is very low indeed. The public mind there, he says, has a strong "tendency to rationalism in its extreme — that is . . . . to treating all religion with levity, indifference, or disbelief."[1] He draws the following graphic sketch of the present fallen condition of religion in Geneva, the former center of Calvinism:

"I happened to be in Geneva one Sunday morning as the bells were tolling for church. The very sounds which once called the powerful minds of a Calvin, a Knox, a Zuingli, to religious exercise and meditation, were now summoning the descendants of their cotemporaries to the same house of prayer. There are few Scotchmen whose hearts would not respond to such a call. I hastened to the ancient cathedral, the church of St. Peter, to see the pulpit from which Calvin had preached, to sit possibly in the very seat from which John Knox has listened, to hear the pure doctrines of Christianity from the preachers who now stand where once the great champion of the reformation stood; to mark, too, the order and observances of the Calvinistic service here in its native church; to revive, too, in my mind, Scotland and the picturesque Sabbath days of Scotland in a foreign land. But where is the stream of citizens' families in the street, so remarkable a feature in every Scotch town when the bells are tolling to church? . . . — Geneva, the seat and center of Calvinism, the fountain-head from which the pure and living waters of our Scottish Zion flow, the earthly source, the pattern, the Rome of our Presbyterian doctrine and practice, has fallen lower from her own original doctrine and practice than ever Rome fell. Rome has still superstition; Geneva has not even that semblance of religion. In the head church of the original seat of Calvinism, in a city of five and twenty thousand souls, at the only service on the Sabbath day — there being no evening service — I sat down in a congregation of about two hundred females, and three and twenty males, mostly elderly men of a former generation, with scarcely a youth, or boy, or working man among them. A meagre liturgy, or printed form of prayer, a sermon, which, as far as religion was concerned, might have figured the evening before at the meeting of some geological society, as an 'ingenious essay' on the Mosaic chronology, a couple of psalm tunes on the organ, and a waltz to go out with, were the church service. In the afternoon the only service in towns or in the country is reading a chapter of the Bible to the children, and hearing them gabble over their catechism in a way which shows they have not a glimpse of the meaning. A pleasure tour in the steamboats, which are regularly advertised for a Sunday promenade around the lake, a pic-nic dinner in the country, and overflowing congregations in the evening at the theater, the equestrian circus, the concert saloons, ball rooms, and coffee houses, are all that distinguish Sunday from Monday, in that city in which, three centuries before, Calvin moved the senate and the people to commit to the flames his own early friend Servetus, the discoverer of the circulation of the blood, and one of the first philosophers of the age, for presuming to differ in opinion and strength of argument from his own religious dogma.

---

[1] Page 206.

This is action and reaction in religious spirit with a vengeance. In the village churches along the Protestant side of the lake of Geneva — spots upon the earth, the traveler would say, especially intended to elevate the mind of man to his Creator by the glories of the surrounding scenery — the rattling of the billiard balls, the rumbling of the skittles trough, the shout, the laugh, the distant shots of the rifle-gun clubs, are heard above the psalm, the sermon, and the barren forms of state prescribed prayer, during the one brief service on Sundays, delivered to very scanty congregations, in fact, to a few females and a dozen or two old men, in very populous parishes supplied with able and zealous ministers."[1]

This is, indeed, "a reaction in religious spirit with a vengeance!" Geneva began by renouncing Catholicity, and substituting for it a sad and gloomy religious system of her own devising; she has ended by renouncing Christianity itself!

We might easily show that, in the other continental countries of Europe, in Sweden, in Norway, in Denmark, in Holland, and in France, Protestantism has fallen as low as in Geneva and in Prussia, and that, at this day, it scarcely retains even a semblance of religion. It has run its wild and eccentric race, and has reached the very abyss into which its enlightened opponents foretold, three centuries ago, it would certainly fall — the abyss of rationalism and infidelity. Alas! for that pride of individual judgment, which was the fatal first error of the reformers, and which has led to the ruin of all religion among the children of their earliest followers! "Every man who exalteth himself shall be humbled," said our divine Saviour more than eighteen centuries ago.

In strong contrast with this low condition of religion in Protestant countries, is its actual state in those which have retained the venerable faith of antiquity. In these you find evils and scandals, it is true, but you find also a strong faith and a growing fervor of devotion among the great body of the people. Some deists and some irreligious persons there may be, but their number is inconsiderable, and they generally keep their infidelity to themselves. All things considered, the Roman Catholic Church is as strong now, both as to numbers and influence, as she ever was in her palmiest days; if she is not even stronger, which there is every reason to believe. Her ministers are, perhaps, more zealous, learned, and devoted, than at any former period. Her missionaries still go forth to the farthest ends of the earth, with the same heroic ardor as animated the first apostles; and martyrdom often crowns their zeal in the midst of the most brilliant conquests of the cross, borne by them in triumph to the far off barbarians of the eastern and western hemispheres.

Strange as it may appear, Mr. Laing acknowledges all this, fully admits the marked contrast between the present condition of Catholicity and of Protestantism on the European continent, and is much at a loss to account for the fact. He devotes a whole chapter to this subject;[2] and we have found it the most curious, candid, and interesting in the work. His theory seems to be, that our Church machinery is much superior to that of Protestantism; that our clergy are, at least comparatively to the people, better educated, that they are more disinterested, more cut off from the world, and therefore more influential with the people than the Protestant; that our doctrines and worship are more mysterious and much more sacred in the eyes of those who believe them; and that our religion has more apparent unity, besides an elasticity which adapts it better to every class of minds. All this may be ingenious enough; and it is as much as we could possibly have expected from even an enlightened and candid Scotch Presbyterian. But a much simpler and far more satisfactory theory to account for this acknowledged superiority, would have been the simple statement and acknowledgment of a palpable fact or truth; — that Catholicity is divine, and Protestantism human. This alone can explain the difference.

---

[1] Pages 305-6.

[2] Chapter xxi.

We cannot better close this article than with two or three extracts from the chapter of our author above alluded to. They will speak for themselves, and will need no comment:

> "The power of ancient Rome, in the meridian of her glory, was not so wonderful as her subsequent and her present dominion over the mind of man. Physical power we can understand. We see its growth. We see its cause along with its effect. We see armies in front, and civil authority in rear. But this moral power, this government over the mind, extending through regions more vast and distant than ever the Roman arms conquered, is the most extraordinary phenomenon in human history. The papist claims it as a proof of the divine origin and truth of his doctrine. The Protestant and the philosopher inquire what principles of human origin give this power over the minds of men such wonderful extension and durability."[1]
>
> "Catholicity has certainly a much stronger hold over the human mind than Protestantism. The fact is visible and undeniable, and perhaps, not unaccountable. The fervor of devotion among these Catholics, the absence of all worldly feelings in their religious acts, strike every traveler who enters a Roman Catholic church abroad. They seem to have no reserve, no false shame, false pride, or whatever the feeling may be, which, among us Protestants, makes the individual exercise of devotion private, hidden—an affair of the closet. Here and every where in Catholic countries, you see well dressed people, persons of the higher as well as of the lower orders, on their knees upon the pavement of the church, totally regardless of, and unregarded by the crowd of passengers in the aisles moving to and fro. I have Christian charity enough to believe, and I do not envy that man's mind who does not believe, that this is quite sincere devotion, and not hypocrisy, affectation, or attempt at display. It is so common, that none of these motives could derive the slightest gratification from the act; not more than a man's vanity could be gratified by his appearing in shoes, or a hat, where all wear the same. In no Protestant place of worship do we witness the same intense abstraction in prayer, the same unaffected devotion of mind. The beggar woman comes in here, and kneels down by the side of the princess, and evidently no feeling of intrusion suggests itself in the mind of either. To the praise of the papist, be it said, no worldly distinctions,

---

[1] Page 394.

or human rights of property, much less money payment for places in a house of worship, appear to enter into their imaginations. Their churches are God's houses, open alike to all his rational creatures, without distinction of high or low, rich or poor. All who have a soul to be saved come freely to worship. They have no family pews, or seats for genteel souls, and seats for vulgar souls. Their houses of worship are not let out, like theaters, or opera houses, or Edinburg kirks, for money rents for the sittings. The public mind is evidently more religionized than in Protestant countries.[1]

"The sleek, fat, narrow-minded, wealthy drone, is now to be sought for on the Episcopal bench, or in the prebendal stall of the Lutheran or Anglican churches; the well-off, comfortable parish minister, yeoman-like in mind, intelligence, and social position, in the manse and glebe of the Calvinistic church. The poverty-stricken, intellectual recluse, never seen abroad but on his way to or from his studies, or church duties, living no body knows where, but all know in the poorest manner, upon a wretched pittance in his obscure abode, and this is the popish priest of the nineteenth century, has all the advantage of position with the multitude for giving effect to his teaching. Our clergy, especially in Scotland, have a very erroneous impression of the state of the popish clergy. In our country churches, we often hear them prayed for as men wallowing in luxury, and sunk in gross ignorance. This is somewhat injudicious, as well as uncharitable; for when the youth of their congregations who, in this traveling age, must often come in contact abroad with the Catholic clergy so described, find them in learning, liberal views, and genuine piety, according to their own doctrines, so very different from the description and the describers, there will unavoidably arise comparisons, in the minds especially of females and young susceptible persons, by no means edifying or flattering to their clerical teachers at home. . . . . . Our churchmen should understand better the strength of a formidable adversary, who is evidently gaining ground but too fast on our Protestant church, and who in this age brings into the field zeal and purity of life equal to their own, and learning, a training in theological scholarship, and a general knowledge superior, perhaps, to their own. The education of the regular clergy of the Catholic Church is, perhaps, positively higher, and beyond doubt comparatively higher, than the education of the Scotch clergy."[2]

We hope all will purchase and read this work of Mr. Laing.

[1] Pp. 394-5.

[2] Pp. 399, 400.

XXVII. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.*

ARTICLE III.—ENGLAND, AS SHE IS AND WAS.

English boasting—What is the condition of her people?—Has her greatness elevated the masses of her population?—A land of social contrasts—English pauperism a crime—Frightful condition of English operatives—Summary of evidence on the subject—How England relieves her poor—The work-houses—The dying pauper—Testimony of Dr. Southey—No liberty for the poor in England—Immorality of London—The Anglican establishment—England evangelizing the world!—The English aristocracy—Brougham on English taxation—Mammonism in England and America—Portrait of Daniel O'Connell.

For three hundred years, England has been basking in the glorious sunshine of the reformation. For three hundred years, she has been under the manifold influences of that great religious revolution, which, in the sixteenth century, promised to emancipate the human mind from a degrading servitude, and to re-instate it in its original dignity and moral grandeur. For three hundred years, has she been boasting her own superior enlightenment over the other nations of the civilized world, and disdainfully sneering at the condition of people less favored.

But, with all this loud boasting, what is her real condition? What is the social and moral condition of the great mass of her population? Have her people been really elevated in the scale of society? Are they more free, more enlightened, more comfortable, more happy, than they were in the good old Catholic times, when the sea-girt Isle acknowledged the sway of the Roman Pontiffs, and bowed reverently at the time-honored altars of the Catholic worship? Or, have they, on the contrary, been lowered in all these important respects? Has the shipwreck of the ancient faith in England been followed by that of popular virtue, of popular comfort, of popular happiness? And if so, has this deterioration been the natural and necessary consequence of the change in religion? We will endeavor briefly to answer these important questions in the present paper.

That England at the present day is, in a certain sense, great and glorious, we not only do not pretend to deny, but we expressly admit. Her manufactures have attained a perfection even surpassing the most sanguine anticipations, and have flourished beyond all precedent. Her commerce is truly gigantic: she trades with the whole world; her merchantmen fill every ocean and sea, and crowd every port of the nations, whether barbarian or civilized. Some years ago she broke down the iron wall which shut the rest of the world out from China, and she made a most important treaty of commerce with his "Celestial Majesty, the brother of the moon." Her navy rides triumphant in every sea and ocean. Her empire bestrides the earth; the sun never sets on her dominions. She has dominions in Europe, in Asia, in America, in Africa, and in the islands of the Pacific and Atlantic oceans. Yet, with all this colossal power and grandeur, what is the social, moral, and religious condition of her people at home;—to say nothing of the millions of crouching slaves who tremble under her iron scepter abroad? She has her glory; but has she not, also, her burning shame? Like the old Roman empire, she has extended her power over the world; but has she not, too, like the old Roman empire, established her political ascendency by the most unhallowed means? Has she not, like that, crushed all whom she subdued, and cemented her iron power by the sufferings and blood of her subjects, both at home and abroad? Have not *might* and *right* been held as synonymous terms in her political vocabulary? In one word, has her political ascendency been of real service to humanity? Has it bettered the condition of the *people* whom it has bowed down?

---

* *The Glory and Shame of England.* "*In England, those who till the earth, and make it lovely and fruitful by their labors, are only allowed the slave's share of the many blessings they produce.*" By C. Edwards Lester; in 2 vols., 12mo. pp. 253, 293. New York Harper & Brothers. 1841.

Upon this important question, Mr. Lester has entered at great length, and with considerable depth of research and acuteness of reasoning. He has discussed it in all its bearings, and with a mind more free from the taint of anti-Catholic prejudice than we could have looked for in an American Protestant. And though he approached the subject with a strong preference for republican institutions, and a deeply rooted antipathy to monarchy, yet he has examined it with dignity and temper. As an evidence that his production was viewed as respectable and able, we may allege the fact, that its appearance created quite a sensation in England, and drew forth a reply, to which Mr. Lester has rejoined in a more recent work.[1] In this last publication, he makes good all the positions advanced in the "Glory and Shame of England," and presents much additional matter. The style of both works is dignified, chaste, terse, and vigorous.

England is eminently a land of social contrasts. This feature is, perhaps, the first which strikes the eye of the traveler. Gorgeous wealth and squalid misery; the greatest learning, and the most supine ignorance; the most refined luxuries and the most unqualified wretchedness; men rolling in splendid equipages, clad in silk and purple, and lolling on soft cushions, and their fellow-beings half naked and starving around them in thousands:—such are a few of the striking contrasts in the social condition of England. In the language of Mr. Lester:

"Show me a very *learned* man in England, and I will show you some thousands around him to match the spectacle, who cannot read the Bible nor write their names: a rich man, and I will show you a thousand beggars: a polished and beautiful woman, who seems to have only enough of the earthly mingled in her constitution to say that she is mortal; one who in her grace and loveliness, would almost make you believe she had sprung, like the fabled Muses, from heaven; and hard by, yea, following her carriage, I will show you one—made as beautiful and as good as she, who is driven to sell her virtue for a bit of bread; who hunts the filthy drains for a morsel of castaway food; and who, in default of that, is gathering with her naked hands the vilest filth of the streets into her apron to sell for manure, to enrich that 'beautiful creature's' estate, that her degraded sister may, for her labor, get a crust or a bone before she dies."[1]

---

[1] Entitled—the Fate and Condition of England.

True, these painful contrasts meet the eye in almost every country of the old world; but in England they are more strongly marked, more harsh and grating on the feelings of the heart, as well as more numerous. There is little to mitigate the ruggedness, or to soften down the harshness of such scenes in England; whereas, in the Catholic countries of Europe, there are many things which tend to alleviate suffering, and to dry up the tear of the afflicted.

In England, pauperism is a crime punishable by the laws; in Italy, for example, it is a misfortune to be commiserated and relieved; in England, the poor, constituting the great mass of the population, are viewed with loathing and abhorrence, as objects fit only to be down-trodden and crushed in the dust; in Italy, they are regarded with compassion, and are raised up from their degradation by the sympathetic hand of Christian charity. In England, the fountains of charity seem to have been almost entirely dried up by the parching heat of avarice; in Italy, they are always full and ever flowing, to irrigate, with their cooling waters, the parched and impoverished portions of the land. Those who have carefully studied the social condition of the poor in both these countries, cannot fail to recognize the truth of this picture.

In regard to England, Mr. Lester affords us ample information to make good our assertion. He has bestowed particular attention on the subject of English poverty; and has unfolded both its lamentable extent, and its more lamentable causes. We will furnish a few extracts from his interesting work, on this subject. After speaking of the princely wealth and gorgeous establishments of the aristocracy, he thus discourses on the condition of the poor:

"But it has been well said by an Englishman himself, that 'to talk of English happiness is like talking of Spartan freedom—the Helots are overlooked.' But the mass of hearts beat in the bosoms of the poor (the Helots of the country,) whose every desire is ungratified, but the wish to hide away in the still, kind grave, from

'The oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely.'

He must be a superficial observer of the state of society here, who does not discover that, just in proportion as the higher classes advance in wealth, power, and influence, are the poor depressed. What is gained by the few, is lost by the many. If the land holder grows rich, his pockets are filled by the odious and unjust tax upon the necessaries of life, which falls chiefly upon the poor. If the Manchester manufacturer amasses a colossal fortune by underselling his competitors in every market in the world, it is because his dependant operatives do not receive a fair compensation for their labor. If the bishop rolls in wealth, his luxuries are the price of the hunger and nakedness of thousands in his diocese. If a Lord Lieutenant of Ireland throws up his commission after a month's administration, and retires to a *Chateau* on the continent on £5,000 a year, this sum is wrung from the starving peasantry of that misgoverned island. It would have been far better for the *poor* of England, if their country had never attained her present commercial eminence; for every step of her advancement has crushed them deeper in poverty."[1]

---

[1] Vol. i, pp. 238-9.

The condition of those large portions of the English laborers, who are employed as operatives in manufacturing districts, is appalling almost beyond conception. Let us glance at the picture drawn of their condition by Dr. Southey, an Englishman, and the late Poet Laureate of the English court. Surely *his* testimony is unexceptionable. In his Espriella Letters, he thus discourses on the subject:

"They are deprived in childhood of all instruction and all enjoyment; of the sports in which childhood instinctively indulges; of fresh air by day, and of natural sleep by night. Their health, physical and moral, is alike destroyed; they die of diseases induced by unremitting task-work, by confinement in the impure atmosphere of crowded rooms; by the particles of metallic or vegetable dust which they are continually inhaling; or they live to grow up without decency, without comfort, and without hope; without morals, without religion, and without shame; and bring forth slaves, like themselves, to tread in the same path of misery. The dwellings of the laboring manufacturers are in narrow streets and lanes, blockaded up from light and air; crowded together, because every inch of land is of such value that room for light and air cannot be afforded them. Here in Manchester, a great proportion of the poor lodge in cellars, damp and dark, where every kind of filth is suffered to accumulate, because no exertions of domestic care can ever make such homes decent. Those places are so many hot-beds of infection, and the poor in large towns are rarely or never without an infectious fever amongst them; a plague of their own which leaves the habitations of the rich, like a Goshen of cleanliness and comfort, unvisited.

"Wealth flows into the country; but how does it circulate there? Not equally and healthfully through the whole system; it sprouts into wens and tumors, and collects in aneurisms, which starve and palsy the extremities. The government, indeed, raises millions as easily as it raised thousands in the days of Elizabeth; the metropolis is six times the size that it was a century ago. . . . A thousand carriages drive about the streets of London, where, three generations ago, there were not a hundred; a thousand hackney-coaches are licensed in the same city, where, at the same distance of time, there was not one; they whose grandfathers dined at noon from wooden trenchers, and from the produce of their own farms, sit down by the light of waxen tapers to be served upon silver, and to partake of delicacies from the four quarters of the globe.

"But the numbers of the poor and the sufferings of the poor have continued to increase; the price of every thing they consume has always been advancing, and the price of labor, the only commodity they have to dispose of, remains the same. Work-houses are erected in one place, and infirmaries in another; the poor rates increase in proportion to the taxes; and in times of dearth, the rich even purchase food and retail it to them at reduced prices, or supply them with it gratuitously; still every year adds to their number. Necessity is the mother of crime; new prisons are built, new punishments are enacted; but the poor become year after year more numerous, more miserable, and more depraved; and this is the inevitable tendency of the manufacturing system."[1]

---

[1] Vol. i, p. 141 seqq.

The condition of the entire body of English operatives is not only miserable in the extreme, it is absolutely revolting. We will present a few more extracts from our author on this topic. He says, speaking of the manufacturing system in England:

"There is not a branch of this immense system of manufacture, in which there is not a painful sacrifice of health and life. The ignorance, vice, disease, deformity, and wretchedness of the English operatives as a body, almost exceed belief. The philanthropists of England should relax nothing in their exertions for the emancipation of the millions still held in bondage in their foreign possessions: but I am persuaded, the physical miseries of the English operatives are greater by far than *the West India slaves suffered before their emancipation*. The hundreds of thousands of a tender age employed in all these various branches of manufacture, are, in all cases, the children of the poor; many of them the children of paupers, apprenticed to the proprietors of factories by the parish authorities; for when the father goes to the work-house, he has no longer any voice in the management of his children. (!) They are separated at the will of the parish. It is said that this class, which is very numerous, fares harder than any other, which can readily be believed. They are, to all intents and purposes, as absolutely under the control of their masters as though they were slaves. There is hardly an instance in which the law ever interferes for their protection, let the abuse be what it may. They are too ignorant to understand their rights, and too weak to assert them; they are trained up to one single branch of labor, and forever disqualified for every thing else; they are neither instructed in religion, science, nor the common business and economy of life.[2]

All this he abundantly proves by facts which fell under his own observation, by the authority of the superintendents in the various factories, and by the official Reports made to the British Parliament. The horrors which those Reports reveal; the iniquities which they have brought to light from the depths of the collieries and the cellars of the manufacturing districts; the amount of ignorance, of crime, of utter and hopeless wretchedness they disclose, almost stagger belief. We can make room for but one instance, out of the many contained in these Reports, as a specimen of the rest:

"Evidence of Eliza Marshall. Eliza Marshall lives at Leeds; worked at Marshall's factory. Am seventeen years old. Father dead. Sister and self did what we could to support mother. Have cried many an hour in the factory. Could scarcely get home; sometimes had to be trailed home. I have an iron on my right leg, and my knee is contracted. Worked in great pain and misery. I was straight before. Sister carried me up to bed many a time. The surgeon says it is with long standing at the mill, and that the *marrow is quite dried up*, and will never be formed again."[1]

---

[1] Quoted by Lester, Ibid. pages 144-5.

[2] Vol. i, pages 161-2.

This fact, which is but one out of a thousand of a similar kind, may serve to show us with what wanton cruelty the English operatives are often treated by their relentless task-masters. The following additional extract from the testimony of a Protestant and an eye-witness, will give us some farther information on this subject, and will also unfold something of the moral condition of those laboring in the factories of England:

"I went into the houses of many of the hands, and, almost without an exception, they were filthy gloomy places. Few of the comforts of life were to be seen there; and the stench was dreadfully offensive. Animal food they seldom eat, potatoes and the coarest bread being almost their entire food; and but few of them have enough of this. The operatives nearly all look unhealthy;—pallid, sallow, and worn out; destitute of spirit and enfeebled by privation and hard work. The apprenticed children are very often treated with greater cruelty than slaves, and are, perhaps, worse off. And I think the morals of the English operatives must be very depraved. I saw multitudes of women with their persons most immodestly exposed at their work; and heard a good deal of lewd conversation between the different sexes. Many of the children, also, in some of the mills, are nearly naked. Indeed, it is impossible, I think, to preserve much purity among persons accustomed to such habits."[2]

Such, then, is the appalling condition of the poor in Protestant England, amid the full enlightenment of the nineteenth century! Such is the moral canker which corrodes her heart! And this is that proud and loudly boasting England, which is forever speaking of her own superior enlightenment, sneering at her neighbors, and thrusting her philanthropy upon other nations. Truly may we address her in the language of the Gospel; "Thou hypocrite! cast out first the beam from thy own eye, and then shalt thou see to cast out the mote from thy brother's eye." Enfranchise the slaves who are groaning in bondage in thy own land; and then think of adopting measures for emancipating slaves elsewhere: evangelize thy own ignorant population, many of whom do not know who Christ is;[3] and then think of preaching to heathen nations abroad. To attempt the latter without the former were glaring inconsistency, if not arrant hypocrisy.

What means has Protestant England adopted to relieve the necessities of her starving poor? What has her philanthropy, of which she makes so much parade, prompted her to do for this purpose?

The answer is soon given. She taxes her already tax-ridden people, to support the poor; she considers poverty a crime which deserves imprisonment for life! She offers to the miserable paupers who fill her land the alternative of either starving, or being shut up in a work-house for life! Begging is prohibited by law. If the poor choose the work-house, the bare necessaries of life are doled out to them by hirelings with a niggardly hand; and even this is not always done: they often suffer for what is indispensable for sustaining life; and after dragging out a miserable existence in bondage, they die of want in some neglected corner or dismal cellar. What Charles Dickens says of the poor-house system in England, in his inimitable Oliver Twist, is scarcely exaggerated: the evils and brutal disorders, which he so eloquently deplores, still cry aloud to heaven for vengeance. We will give a few specifications from the work of Mr. Lester:

---

[1] Ibid. page 163.

[2] Vol. I, pp. 208-9.

[3] See the Parliamentary Reports, above referred to.

"The English work-houses are reckoned among the 'Charities.' Perhaps it would be well to find for them some other name. Some of these work-houses, do, indeed, afford comfortable homes for the poor; (as the word *comfort* is defined in the vocabulary of men who have learned to dispense with the greater part of what other men call the necessaries of life.) But there is nothing so painful, I find, as the thought of being one day compelled to enter a work-house. It is a dark cloud, that hangs on the vision of every poor man in England when he looks into the future. These work-houses are often the scenes of great cruelty, privation, and suffering. . . . . In many instances, the keepers speculate on the stomachs of parish paupers; keeping them upon short or damaged food; denying them many of the most common necessaries of life, and all its comforts. Instances are not a few, in which the inmates die in lonely, filthy chambers by night, without medical aid, without an attendant, without even a rush-light to flicker over their pillows, while they are passing through death's struggles. The selfish avarice of the keeper combines with the interest of the parish to shorten the pauper's days, and to rid themselves of the thankless burden as quickly as possible. To accomplish this, the cords of life are cut asunder by cold neglect and barbarous treatment.

"All that is known in such cases, is, that the prayer of the dying pauper is often denied, when he asks that the physician may come to him, or some one watch by his bed; or the minister of religion be called to breathe out a prayer for his soul; or, if he is to be left entirely alone while the soul is breaking away from its shattered house, that they will have mercy and bring a light, that the darkness of night may not mingle with the death-shades of the grave as they settle over his bed of rags. In the morning, they go to his chamber, and find that he is dead. It causes no grief; no friend was with him when he died—but God. A rough coffin is ordered—price seven shillings and six pence,—the body is taken away, and that is the end of the pauper; his dying groan heard only by the ear of a merciful God; over his grave no tear of affection is shed; no monument ever rises; and in a little while no one but He, whose all-seeing eye notices the falling sparrow, can tell whose grave it is where the pauper sleeps. The work-house is a gloomy place for the poor to go to; it is one of the most dismal places I ever entered. In the best of them, England does not pay back to the pauper half the law has taken from his former earnings. It would be a difficult matter, I apprehend, to find many persons in the parish work-house, who have not paid far more to support the government which has impoverished them, than the parish pays for their support when they can work no longer."[1]

Let us also hear what Dr. Southey says on this subject:

"When the poor can contribute no longer to their own support, they are removed to what is called the work-house. I cannot express to you the feeling of hopelessness and dread with which all the decent poor look to this wretched termination of a life of labor. To this place all vagrants are sent for punishment; unmarried women with child go here to be delivered; and poor orphans and base born children are brought up here till they are of age to be apprenticed off; the other inmates are those unhappy people who are utterly helpless; — parish idiots and mad-men, the blind and the palsied, and the old, who are fairly worn out. It is not in the nature of things that the superintendents of such institutions as these should be gentle-hearted, when the superintendence is undertaken merely for the salary. There are always enough of competitors for the management among those people who can get no better situations; but, whatever kindness of disposition they may bring with them to the task, it is soon perverted by the perpetual sight of depravity and suffering. The management of children who grow up without one natural affection, where there is none to love them, and, consequently, none whom they can love, would alone be sufficient to sour a happier disposition than is usually brought to the government of a work-house. To this society of wretchedness the laboring poor of England look as their last resting place on this side of the grave; and, rather than enter abodes so miserable, they endure the severest privations as long as it is possible to exist. A feeling of honest pride makes them shrink from a place where guilt and poverty are confounded; and it is heart-breaking for those who have reared a family of their own, to be subjected in their old age to the harsh and unfeeling authority of persons younger than themselves, neither better born nor better bred. They dread. also, the disrespectful and careless funeral, which public charity, or rather, law bestows; and many a wretched pauper denies himself the few sordid comforts within his reach, in order that he may hoard up enough to purchase a more decent burial, a better shroud, or a finer coffin than the parish will afford."[1]

---

[1] Vol. i, p. 152, seqq.

But these are not the only evils of the poor-house system in England. Through it a most cruel and vexatious espionage is exercised over the movements of the poor; a very poor man in England has not the freedom of locomotion; the poor laws compel him to remain in his parish! Let us again hear the candid Dr. Southey, who has done much to lay bare the crying iniquities of the whole system:

"We talk of the liberty of the English, and they talk of their own liberty; but *there is no liberty in England for the poor.* They are no longer sold with the soil, it is true; but they cannot quit the soil, if there be any probability or suspicion that age or infirmity may disable them. If, in such a case, they endeavor to remove to some situation where they hope more easily to maintain themselves; where work is more plentiful or provisions cheaper, the overseers are alarmed; the intruder is apprehended, as if he were a criminal, and sent back to his own parish! Wherever a pauper dies, that parish must be at the cost of his funeral; instances, therefore, have not been wanting of wretches in the last stage of disease having been hurried away in an open cart upon straw, and dying upon the road! Nay, even women in the very pains of labor have been driven out, and have perished by the way-side, because the birthplace of the child would be its parish!"[2]

Gentle reader, the land in which all these startling cruelties and abominations are practised is not Mohammedan nor Pagan; it is Christian, enlightened, Protestant England! It is the country which boasts more than any other of its refinement and of its philanthropy; it is the land which claims a right to scoff at the institutions and morals of other countries not blessed with the dazzling light of the reformation. It is the freest, most enlightened, most prosperous, and most powerful Protestant nation in Europe. And bear in mind, too, that we are not hazarding statements on suspicious authority; we are not quoting the enemies of England to prove the truth of these enormities; we are simply recording the unexceptionable evidence of her own Protestant citizens.

---

[1] Espriella Letters — quoted above

[2] Espriella Letters, apud Lester, vol. 1, p. 181-2.

With such an amount of wretchedness, squalid misery, and degradation among the operatives and the poor,—the bulk of her population; with such a mass of popular ignorance as authentic Parliamentary Reports have recently disclosed; we are not at all surprised at the amazing extent of crime and immorality in England. We would be rather astonished, on the contrary, that a people so ignorant and so degraded should be moral. What refinement or morality could we expect to find among a people, whose only popular amusements are horse-racing, cock-fighting, and boxing? From a people who flock with eagerness to witness executions, and who gloat over tales of horror and the most revolting exhibitions of cruelty?[1]

The immorality of London is truly appalling. To say nothing of the immense number of schools of vice, in which young boys and young girls are trained up in all the arts of the skillful thief and pick-pocket; to say nothing of the thousands of houses where stolen goods are regularly received; and confining our attention solely to immorality of another and more revolting kind, we may say with truth, that London is the most immoral city on the face of the earth, if we except, perhaps, Stockholm, the capital of Protestant Sweden. A recent Parliamentary Report makes the number of females in London, who have forgotten to be virtuous, exceed eighty thousand; and many think that it reaches one hundred thousand! Add to this the frightful extent to which gin-drinking and drunkenness are carried; an idea of which may be found in the startling fact, that, in that city, there are twelve thousand females who are public and notorious drunkards! The degradation of English females is often a natural consequence of their poverty and wretchedness. They sell their virtue for bread. An intelligent Englishman — Captain Miller — assured Mr. Lester, "that the number of women who perish by such a mode of life in this country (England), exceeds that of any other country in the whole world, by at least three to one in proportion to the population." And he added: "It is a flagrant stigma on the legislature, that it has neither the courage nor the Christianity to take up this matter, and devise a natural resource for these persons."[2]

Many more facts of a similar character we might allege from the pages of Mr. Lester's book; but we sicken at these enormities; and what we have already extracted will suffice to reveal the shame of England, as the dark shade cast by the colossus of her glory. The glory and the shame go together; they are intimately connected; the former has caused the latter. Nothing is more certain, than that the misery, the degradation, the immorality of the poorer classes in England, are fairly ascribable to the overgrown power, to the bloated wealth, and to the pride and hard-hearted avarice of the higher orders. If England is great, and wealthy, and powerful, we must never forget that all this greatness is based on the wretchedness and squalid misery of the mass of her population.

---

[1] Many persons in London have made handsome fortunes by letting seats to those desirous of witnessing executions,—and by getting up wax figure representations of the various agonies of the victims; to say nothing of those who bet at a boxing match.

[2] Vol. ii, p. 259.

It is curious to trace the rise, progress, and causes of pauperism in England. William Cobbett has done this; and he has proved, by a mass of evidence which cannot be answered, that it is, in all its appalling extent and its startling evils, fairly traceable to the change of religion, miscalled the reformation. The facts and reasoning of Mr. Lester on the same subject go far to confirm the position of Cobbett; and his testimony is the less exceptionable, as, in the train of his reasoning, he does not appear to contemplate this conclusion. Our limits will allow us to hint at only a few of the more prominent facts which he alleges, in illustration of this remark.

One of the first and chief causes of popular distress in England is the overgrown wealth of the church establishment;—a wealth filched, in a great measure, from the hard earnings of the poor, and spent either abroad, or in luxuries at home. In the good old Catholic times, this wealth was made to circulate freely among the poor; charity dispensed it with a lavish hand for the relief of suffering; it reared hospitals for the sick, asylums—not work-houses—for the poor and disabled; and it scattered over England beautiful and magnificent churches and monasteries. It was thus expended for the benefit of the poor, and for the improvement of society.

Such is not, alas! the case at present in Protestant England. The princely incomes of the English bishops and clergy go to provide places for their children and relatives, or for the advantage of their generally numerous families. Little of this vast wealth ever finds its way to the hovels or cottages of the poor. Little of it is employed in building churches, schools, or hospitals. On the contrary, many of the most stately old Catholic churches of England, now used for Protestant worship, have been suffered to decay or to become sadly out of repair. Every one knows the great outcry lately raised in England about the general neglect of popular education; an outcry, which reached the house of Commons, and made Sir James Graham bring in a bill for promoting education, especially in the manufacturing districts. And every one knows, too, how this bill was defeated, or at least dropped by the British ministry. Its defeat is solely ascribable to the narrow-minded intolerance of the Anglican bishops and clergy, who would consent to have no schools established, which would not be under their own control and management. Thus, they would neither educate the people themselves, nor suffer others to do it. We consider the church establishment in England as the greatest curse to that country, both in a religious and in a political point of view. In this opinion Mr. Lester fully concurs. He says:

> "How many hard-earned dollars has that poor widow (whose distress and religious ignorance he had just been describing) paid to support the Established Church of England, and how much advantage has she ever derived from it? It matters not how much ecclesiastical dignitaries may prate and write about 'our holy religion,' 'the apostolical succession,' and 'the divine right of kings and bishops;' one such case as this cannot be disposed of by an argument as long as the Bodleian library. It matters not how much they declaim from the pulpit about the mercy of God, and His regard for the poor. The poor are told that these men are the heaven descended ministers of this religion;—men who afflict the poor;—who shoot widows' sons to get their tithes, (for cases of this kind have occurred in Ireland,) and at last become infidels. Gibbon, with all his philosophy, did not escape the same conclusion. He tells us the corruptions and abuses of Christianity made him a sceptic. Let the clergy of the church of England preach such doctrines to others than poor widows and hungry children, from whose scanty wages their princely incomes are filched. If there be a structure of tyranny and abuse more iniquitous in the eye of heaven than any other, it is the despotism of a state which converts the sublime religion of Christ into an instrument of avarice and ambition; of ambition for the political elevation of the aristocracy; and of avarice, which starves widows and orphans, to array in gold those who are pompously styled 'God's ministers.' God's ministers they surely are; and so are thunderbolts, tempests, conflagrations, and death!"[1]

This is strong language, but surely not too strong. In another place, he thus twits England on her hypocritical philanthropy and religious zeal:

> "England proposes to evangelize the world! Does she suppose that, while her own people are in a state of political degradation, a state of physical and moral starvation, she can even evangelize *them?* Will a man, whose whole life is beset with toils innumerable to get bread for himself and hungry family, hear, from his oppressors, a word about the sublime and pure doctrines of the Bible, which makes it a high crime to rob the poor of bread? No! he cannot listen to them for very sorrow. First prove yourself his friend and benefactor by feeding his hunger and clothing his nakedness, and then he will hear you. Elevate him to the dignity of a man, by removing your oppressions, and the work of evangelization will be easy."[2]

The bishops and clergy of the establishment are not the only persons who in England roll in wealth, while the poor are starving; the aristocracy are perpetual drains on the labor and resources of the poor. In their hands, and in that of the wealthier classes, is lodged the legislature and judicial power, as well that of the sword. They make laws, and they enforce them by means of an immense standing army. Do the poor complain of being robbed, and of being on the very verge of starvation? Do they organize an agitation to obtain redress for their crying wrongs? Their meetings are dispersed by proclamation; their leaders are arrested,

[1] Vol. i, pp. 195-6.

[2] Vol. ii, pp. 264-5.

and after a trial, in which all justice is openly mocked, they are lodged in a felon's prison! So things are done in Protestant England: it is emphatically a government *for* the rich and *against* the poor; the former are protected, the latter crushed. The chief means of oppressing the poor in England is the imposition of enormous taxes, — more enormous than in any other country under heaven, whether Pagan, Mohammedan, or Christian. These taxes are necessary to support the throne, the government, and the aristocracy, as well as to pay the interest on the immense public debt, which is itself entirely and solely of Protestant origin,— aye, a fruit of the reformation in England. It was contracted, as every one knows, by the Protestant house of Brunswick, for the purpose of maintaining the Protestant ascendency in England on the continent.

Now, only glance at the gigantic iniquity of Anglican Protestantism towards the poor. First, it broke up the monasteries in which they had been sheltered, educated, and fed for centuries: secondly, it covered once "merry England" with paupers, and strewed its surface with work-houses supported by taxation; and thirdly, it saddled England with a debt which she can never pay, and the bare interest on which, paid by taxation, grinds down her people to the dust, and reduces her poor to the very verge of starvation! Such have been the political blessings of the English reformation!

For those living in this country it is almost impossible to conceive the extent to which taxation is carried in England, and how grievously it oppresses the poorer classes. As Mr. Lester well says:

> "It is a government of privileges and monopolies: 'the few are born,' as Mr. O'Connell says, 'booted and spurred to ride over the many.' The working classes are degraded and oppressed. All but the privileged orders are taxed from their birth to their death. The mid-wife that assists in bringing the child into the world; the swaddling clothes in which the infant is wrapped; every mouthful of pap or of bread which it eats during its journey through life; every rag of clothes it puts on, and, at last the winding sheet and the coffin in which it is laid in its mother earth: all are taxed to pamper a haughty aristocracy, a political church, and the privileged orders."[1]

This reminds us of the well known passage of Lord Brougham, in which he paints the horrors of English taxation with as much truth as pungency. We will be pardoned for transcribing the passage entire:

> "The Englishman is taxed for every thing that enters his mouth, covers his back, or is placed under the feet; taxes are imposed on every thing that is pleasant to see, hear, feel, taste, or smell; taxes upon warmth, light, and locomotion; taxes upon every thing on the earth, in the waters, and under the earth; upon every thing that comes from abroad, or is grown at home; taxes upon the raw material, and on every value that is added to it by the ingenuity and industry of man; taxes upon the sauce that pampers man's appetite, and on the drugs that restore him to health; on the ermine that decorates the judge, and on the rope that hangs the criminal; on the brass nails of the coffin, and on the ribbons of the bride:

---

[1] Vol. I. p. 110.

at bed or at board;—*couchant ou levant, we must pay*. The school-boy whips his taxed top; the beardless youth manages his taxed bridle, on a taxed road; and the dying Englishman, pouring his medicine, which has paid seven per cent., into a spoon which has paid thirty per cent., throws himself back on his chintz bed, which has paid twenty-two per cent.; and, having made his will, the seals of which are also taxed, expires in the arms of his apothecary, who has paid £100 for the privilege of hastening his death. His whole property is then taxed from two to ten per cent.; and, besides the expenses of probate, he pays large fees for being buried in the chancel, and his virtues are handed down to posterity on taxed marble; after all which, he may be gathered to his fathers; to be taxed—*no more*."

Such, then, is the startling condition to which the Protestant reformation has reduced England; for her present deplorable state is as fairly traceable to that unhappy revolution, as ever was effect to its cause. Such are the political, moral, religious, and social evils which Protestantism has brought upon once happy and merry England. It has banished Christian charity from that once blessed land, and has substituted, in its stead, a certain human, high-sounding philanthropy, as unreal in its benefits, as it is hypocritical in its professions. It has crushed and banished from the house of God the poor, the favorites of Christ, and the favorites of the Catholic Church. It has enthroned avarice,—griping, hard-hearted avarice, — in the very temple of God; and has ingrained it in the minds and hearts of the English people. This is the main source of almost all the social anomalies and crying evils of England. England affords a practical commentary on that saying of an inspired apostle: "Covetousness is the root of all evils."

Are we in this country wholly free from this taint of avarice; from this fever of covetousness, which dries up the very fountains of Christian charity and benevolence? We wish we could say yes; but alas! the contrary precisely is the case. Let us hear what our own countryman, Mr. Lester, says on this subject:

> "There is with us, among all classes, a feverish desire to become suddenly rich. There are strong bilious tendencies in our climate; and the whole American people are nervous, excitable, and characterized by great cerebral activity. The American launches on a wild, foaming current, the moment he enters the business world. Money is his object. In the restless pursuit of this he gives himself no leisure for literature, none for society, except at some great, vulgar jam, yclept a party. At forty, he is an old man; and in five years more he is dead. It is nonsense to expect such men can live long, — as soon look for a long-lived race horse. We are the least practically philosophical of any people in the world. If a Wall-street banker were to leave his office at two o'clock to spend the rest of the day with his family, he would be hissed on 'Change. Go into any town in the United States, and you will find elderly men in the full zenith of acquisition, and octogenarians who have not yet made enough. *It is lamentable*."[1]

The most *lamentable* circumstance in this picture is its truth. We are imitating England in the very worst feature of her social condition; and

[1] Vol. i, p. 235.

let us beware, lest we imitate her in the ulterior development of this fatal principle. We are yet young and vigorous; but we nurture in our social condition the fatal seeds of decay and ruin. Ere the evil become incurable, let us apply the remedy. The only adequate one is a substitution of the spirit of Catholic, social charity for that of Protestant individuality and avarice. Let us look to it in time.

We will close this rapid notice of Mr. Lester's "Glory and Shame of England," by one more extract, in which he does ample justice to the character of the man who was for forty years the unyielding and incorruptible champion of the poor and oppressed in England, Ireland, and Scotland; who was the "best abused man in the world; we mean, of course, the greatest man of his age, Daniel O'Connell. It is some proof of candor and of a wish to be impartial in Mr. Lester, to have done justice to the character of one, whom, he frankly admits, he had but six months before viewed only "as a bold and reckless demagogue."

"But there is one man in Great Britain who has done, and is still doing, more for humanity than Brougham; one who has been long in public life, mingling in every question which has agitated the empire for a quarter of a century or more; who is always found on the side of the people; who has never tripped, halted, varied, nor shifted his course; who has made more public speeches than any other man now living, and always spoken like a republican; who abhors oppression with all his heart; who has been hated, courted, and feared (but never despised) by every party; a man who has been a target for all Britain to shoot at for a whole generation; who has come off victorious from every conflict, even when he has been beaten; who has never betrayed his principles, but is forever betraying his party, or, who, more properly, has no party but his own; who will be bound by no trammels; who is eternally, and with a zeal which never grows cold, demanding justice for all the subjects of the British empire; a man who now stands higher in the hearts of his countrymen, and in the esteem of the world, than ever. You will most likely burst into a loud laugh, when you see his name:—DANIEL O'CONNELL."[1]

---

[1] Vol. ii, p. 166-7.

XXVIII. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.*

ARTICLE IV.—IRELAND AND THE IRISH.

The great day of reckoning—An historical parallel—Ireland still unconquered—Un-American feeling of hostility to foreigners—Are we really independent of England?—Political nativism—What have foreigners done for the country?—Why Irishmen are hated—The Irish character—Its lights and shades—English treatment of Ireland—The first period of Ireland's sufferings—Protestant evidence—The second period—The reformation in Ireland—Irish fidelity to the ancient faith—Policy of Elizabeth and the Stuarts—Wholesale confiscation and butchery—The men of 1782—The Union—Protestant ascendency—Emancipation.

On that great and dreadful Day of the Lord, when nations as well as individuals shall be placed at the bar of God to be judged according to their works, England will have an awful account to render of her stewardship. Her impoverished and down-trodden population within her own borders, the crushed and degraded millions whom she has enslaved in India, and the widows and orphans whom she has made throughout the world, in her reckless career of ambition, will all rise up in judgment against her. The nations of the civilized earth will stand up too, and will bear evidence to her hard-hearted and relentless avarice, to her utter disregard of the most solemn promises and treaties, to her all-grasping spirit of aggrandizement, and to her entire recklessness as to the means by which her ends were to be attained. And on that awful day of final reckoning, the voice of poor crushed and bleeding Ireland shall be heard pleading, with all the earnest eloquence of truth, that justice, swift and terrible, may at length fall on the head of that unnatural step-dame, to whose wanton cruelty, griping avarice, and iron policy, she owes most of the wrongs which have weighed her down for centuries.

What will England say, when all these terrible witnesses shall appear against her, and when the ghosts of her countless murdered victims shall glare at her "with their fiery eye-balls?" What answer shall she give, when the long and dark roll of her iniquities towards Ireland, shall be unfolded before the judgment-seat of the most just, omnipotent, and all-seeing God of heaven and earth? Will her diplomacy then profit her anything? Will those cunning devices and that political *legerdemain*, by which, on this earth, she has so often succeeded in making "the worse appear the better cause," then avail her aught? No, no. The Lord will then tear from her brow the veil of hypocrisy which has so long concealed her hideous deformities; He will strip her of all disguise, and exhibit her as she is before the assembled world; for on that day "He will reveal the hidden things of darkness, and manifest the counsels of hearts."

---

*1. The Condition and Fate of England. By the author of "the Glory and Shame of England," (C. Edwards Lester.) 2 vols., 12mo. Second edition. New York: J. & H. G. Langley. 1843.

2. The Criminal History of the English Government, from the first massacre of the Irish to the poisoning of the Chinese. By Eugene Regnault. Translated from the French, with Notes by an American. 1 vol., 12mo. New York: Redfield. 1843.

One of the deepest thinkers of Christian antiquity has laid down the comprehensive philosophical maxim, that "God is patient, because he is eternal," —*patiens, quia æternus*. He can bide His time; He need be in no hurry; for He has a whole eternity to reward His friends, and a whole eternity to punish His enemies. A thousand years before Him are as one day which has passed: — time is as nothing; eternity is everything. The wrongs which He permits in time, He will redress in eternity. The injustice which He allows to go on, and the tears and blood which He permits to flow now, He will then remove and wipe away forever. Then shall "all things be made new;" then shall all evils be obliterated from the universe of God; then "shall all tears be wiped away from the eyes (of God's friends), and death shall be no more; nor mourning, nor crying, nor sorrow shall be any more; for the former things will have passed away."[1] Then shall the high be brought low, and the low be made high; the proud humbled, and the humble exalted. Then shall all social and political evils be obliterated, and the social and moral condition of mankind be equalized, and brought into perfect harmony with truth, and justice, and virtue.

And then shall proud England be humbled even unto the dust, and poor bleeding Ireland, which has been down-trodden by her for nearly seven centuries, be raised up from her lowliness, to the lofty eminence to which her noble virtues and her long sufferings have entitled her. This is no mere flight of elevated fancy; it is a solemn and sober religious view of a subject invested with an all-absorbing interest.

The two writers whom we are reviewing, give strong expression to the indignant feelings of large masses of persons in America and France, awakened by the iniquitous policy of England, both domestic and foreign. They both trace the mischievous influence of English legislation on the happiness of large portions of her own exuberant population, as well as the wickedness of English diplomacy in regard to other nations; and they both devote separate books or chapters to the aggravated wrongs of Ireland under English misrule. They deal not in declamation; they strongly appeal to unquestionable facts. They paint England in her towering greatness and in her burning shame; they prove, by evidence which cannot be answered, that she has become great by employing the most unhallowed means, and that her glory is mainly built upon the impoverishment, the degradation, and the ruin of her own subjects at home and abroad, on the perfidy which has almost invariably marked her intercourse with other nations.

---

[1] Apocalypse xxi, 4.

To us it has always seemed, that there exists a striking parallelism between the policy and history of the present British and of the ancient Roman empire. Both attained to the highest pinnacle of grandeur and power, and by very nearly the same means. Cunning diplomacy and brute force, insatiate avarice and unquenchable ambition, iron energy and unconquerable will, are the distinctive characteristics of both, as well as the secret of their success. Both seem to have adopted, as a guiding maxim, the old adage, *Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum;* that is, according to its original legal meaning and acceptation, "Let the law take its course, though the heavens should fall." No matter how many nations and people may lie crushed and bleeding; no matter how much injustice may be perpetrated; no matter how many widows and orphans may be made; no matter how many tears and how much blood may be shed; let the law, which we have enacted for our own aggrandizement, still sternly take its course! Let our iron will be obeyed, though the whole world should lie prostrate and be covered with ruin and desolation! In both empires we trace the same grasping ambition, the same inhuman crushing of conquered provinces, the same spirit of centralization, the same union of church and state, and its concomitant religious persecution; and, in fine, the same all-conquering spirit. The Roman was an empire of iron, and yet it has long since crumbled into dust. Pagan Rome became drunk with the blood of the saints, and filled up the measure of her iniquities, and then God chastised her in His wrath. Let proud Christian England think on the chastisement, and take warning! Pagan Rome was permitted to persecute the Church but three hundred years, and then had she to bite the dust. and be scourged and humbled for her impious attempt to put down the truth.

But our business lies at present with Ireland. Ireland! How the very name thrills through the soul, and stirs the deepest fountains of its sympathy! How many mournful recollections does it not awaken! Who, that has but one spark of generosity yet glowing in his bosom, has not felt his spirit burn within him at the sad rehearsal of Ireland's wrongs! Is there one *man* on the face of the earth who can hear that story unmoved? Is there one who has not shared, to a greater or less extent, in the tender feelings imbodied in the following touching lines of Erin's sweetest, greatest poet?—

"The stranger shall hear thy lament o'er his plains;
The sigh of thy harp shall be sent o'er the deep;
Till thy tyrants themselves, as they rivet thy chains,
Shall pause o'er the songs of their captives and weep."

Though England has labored, for nearly seven centuries, to destroy her nationality, yet is Ireland still a nation. She has not, it is true, a domestic legislature, and she enjoys not political independence; but she still has her national literature, her national poetry, her national eloquence, her national spirit, her national patriotism. She still lives, breathes, feels, moves, and acts as a nation. England may bow down, she cannot destroy, her national character. Brute force may subdue the bodies, it cannot trammel the souls of Irishmen. If the spirit of Ireland could have been broken, seven centuries of the most galling oppression would have broken it; but, thank God, that spirit is still as buoyant, as elastic, as independent as ever. It hates oppression as much as it ever did; it kisses not the rod which scourges it; it cannot be won by bribery, nor conquered by physical force:

> "Ireland still has an existence as a nation. She has her universities and her literature. She is still the 'Emerald Isle of the ocean.' An air of romance and chivalry is around her. The traditionary tales that live in her literature invest her history with heroic beauty. But she has no need of these. Real heroes, the O'Neills, the O'Briens, and the Emmetts, will be remembered as long as self-denying patriotism and unconquerable valor are honored among men. In every department of literature she still takes her place. Where is the wreath her shamrock does not adorn? Where the muse that has not visited her hills? Her harp has ever kindled the soul of the warrior, and soothed the sorrows of the broken-hearted. It has sounded every strain that can move the human heart to greatness, or to love. Whatever vices may stain her people, they are free from the crime of voluntary servitude. The Irishman is the man last to be subdued. Possessing an elasticity of character that will rise under the heaviest oppression, he wants only a favorable opportunity and a single spark to set him in a blaze."[1]

Such is the language of an intelligent American, a Protestant, and a son of the pilgrims; of one who is as liberal in his opinions, as he is fearless in the expression of them. Wide and expansive in his views, generous in his feelings, and truly American in his mind and heart, Mr. Lester seems wholly incapable of any narrow or unworthy prejudices. All nations, and tribes, and peoples, are the same to him. He is a man, and nothing that is human is shut out from his sympathy. Wherever he finds wrong and injustice, his soul melts with compassion, and his spirit kindles with honest indignation against the oppressor. If he hates England, he furnishes abundant reasons for his hatred. If he sympathizes with Ireland, he proves that Ireland is worthy of sympathy. His view of "Ireland under English oppression"[2] is one of the most eloquent and conclusive essays we have ever chanced to read.

We fervently wish that every American had his honest independence and his generous feelings. We wish that every American citizen were as true to the letter and to the spirit of our noble constitution, and to the principles embodied in our Declaration of Independence. But, alas! such is not the case. Disguise the fact as we may, there exists in the minds of a large portion of our population a secret, instinctive, indefinable hatred of Ireland, and contempt of every thing Irish; and, along with this feeling, an overwhelming partiality for England and for every thing English.

---

[1] Lester—Condition and Fate of England, vol. ii, pp. 73, 74.

[2] Ibid book vii, from p. 71 to p. 157.

Our political harangues and Fourth of July orations are high sounding and comprehensive enough; they abound in withering denunciations of tyranny and of tyrants, and are well garnished with expressions of sympathy for the victims of oppression. But the sufferings of poor Ireland under a most atrocious and grinding English oppression are often left out of the account.

We honestly boast of our independence; we sound forth the praises of our revolutionary fathers who broke the trammels of English oppression, and bequeathed the rich inheritance of liberty to their descendants. But are we really *independent* of England? Have we entirely shaken off her yoke? Do we enjoy moral, religious, and intellectual, as well as political freedom? Or are we not, on the contrary, still the unconscious slaves of English prejudice? Are we not still the victims of her narrow-minded religious bigotry? Do we not still look up to her literature, to her philosophy, to her legislation? Have we not been tainted by the poison of her haughtiness, of her selfishness, of her bitter spirit of exclusiveness? Have we not imbibed from her much of her almost Chinese hatred of the "outside barbarians?" In a word, are we independent of England in *mind* as well as in *body;* intellectually and morally, as well as politically? We greatly fear that we are not. England still lords it over us, not, indeed, by her armies, by her navies, and by her iniquitous system of legislation, but by her spirit, her maxims, her policy, and her prejudices, political and religious. Especially are we indebted to her for our secret, though most un-American hostility to foreigners. She has transmitted to us, as a fatal and poisoned heritage, her hereditary dislike of the French, and her intense hatred of the Irish. We cannot explain in any other way the prevalence of such a feeling among us; and that such a feeling does exist, we think no candid man will deny.

We would be doubly proud of our country, could we think that the views of many among our people were more liberal and enlarged than sober truth proves them to be; and that our republic were really what it professes to be, the home of the exile, and the asylum of the oppressed from every nation under the sun. A liberal policy in regard to foreign immigration has contributed more, perhaps, than any other cause, to make our nation what it is. The foreigners, whom this policy has attracted to our shores, have not only swelled our own population, but they have greatly aided in enriching our country, and in developing its resources. They have dug our canals, cleared our forests, tilled our lands, prepared our turnpikes, and laid down our railroads. They have done more than this. They have cheerfully enlisted in our army and navy, have gallantly fought our battles, and have periled their lives for the country of their adoption. They have expended their labor and treasure, and have shed their blood for our benefit. They have entered into the spirit of our institutions, and have labored to become identified with us in feeling and interest. What more could we ask or expect from them?

Yet it cannot be disguised that there is a growing spirit of hostility to foreigners, silently but deeply at work among our people. This is more particularly the case in regard to our Irish fellow-citizens, especially those among them who still fondly cling to the much abused religion of their forefathers. The political bigots among us hate Irishmen, merely because they are Irishmen; our religious bigots hate them because they are Catholics. Both have inherited this hatred from England. The small politicians make capital out of this feeling. On the eve of elections you find this class of men waxing wonderfully warm and sympathetic; they love Irishmen as brethren; they drop tears of compassion over the wrongs of Ireland; they are themselves Irish in feeling and heart. But the election has scarcely passed off, before their friendship has greatly cooled down or vanished entirely; if it has not even been turned into bitter hatred and open denunciation! Thus are the Irish in America courted and kicked by turns. In the end, they get all the abuse and odium, and but little of the honors and emoluments, of the political parties which divide the country.

Is this treatment either generous or just? Do the Irish really deserve it? Is not the Irish character open, sincere, generous? Are not the Irish, as a people, truthful, trustworthy, honest, and patriotic? Is there anything peculiarly wicked or malevolent in their composition? Have they not, as a class, much less selfishness than our own population? Are there among them more sharpers and swindlers than among our own people? Who ever heard of an Irish coward, or of an Irish traitor in America? Who ever heard of an Irishman who, through pusillanimity, skulked from doing his duty to his adopted country? Who ever heard of an Irishman that was ungrateful to his benefactor? In our first struggle for independence, and in our late war with Great Britain, did not the Irish fight side by side with us, animating our own soldiers by their fearless bravery? Can Americans soon forget the glorious names of Montgomery and Barry, to say nothing of other illustrious Irishmen? Can they forget that the Irish were the first people in Europe to sympathize with us in our effort to secure independence, and that this generous sympathy, and the aid Irishmen subsequently afforded us, were alleged by the British court as reasons, why the petitions of Ireland for political and religious enfranchisement should be rejected?

According to the sentiment expressed in a stanza of an old song, generosity to both friends and foes is a distinctive characteristic of Irishmen: —

"What flood reflects a shore so sweet
  As glorious Boyne or past'ral Ban;
Or who a friend or foe can meet,
  So generous as an Irishman?"

The warm-hearted kindness and hospitality of the Irish are proverbial. In them the social feeling predominates over every other sentiment. Ireland is, perhaps, the only country in the world, which combines the warm temperament and generous feelings of the south with the cold climate of the north. An Irish gentleman is one of the very best specimens of human nature. Elevated, chivalrous, and refined, he is also warm-hearted, ready-witted, generous, and affable. His soul is utterly incapable of one thought, or word, or action, that is little or mean. He puts you at your ease, and you feel entirely at home in his company; he forgets himself, and thinks only of those whose society he enjoys.

Faults the Irish have, but what people have not faults? But have they as many, or as glaring ones, as those who are loudest in condemning them? Let him that is without sin himself first cast a stone at his Irish brother! A portion of the poorer Irish in America have faults, some of them grievous and disgraceful; but where and from whom did many of them contract these faults? Did they not, in many cases, learn them from the degraded portion of our own native population? Did not many of them contract habits of intemperance and of its cognate vices, in consequence of the system adopted, and of the evil example set before them, on our public works? Is it generous or right, first to taint them with vice, and then to sneer at them for being vicious? Those who love to moralize, and who have superfluous zeal to expend on the amelioration of society, might find enough to do in correcting the manifold vices of our own people, "to the manor born."

We are natives ourselves, and we have had tolerably good opportunities for studying the moral character of the lower classes among our native and our Irish population; and we are of the opinion that the Irish would not at all suffer in the comparison. The mode of thinking and of judging adopted by some of our people is, indeed, singular enough. If an Irishman is seen drunk, or is heard to swear, immediately you hear sneers about the "low Irish;" but, if an American is caught in the same vicious practices, it seems to create no surprise whatever, and to be all a matter of course in this *free* country! This comes from that lurking prejudice to which we alluded above.

We believe it was the Irish orator, Sheil, who defined an Irishman,—"a man who acts first and thinks afterwards." At any rate, there is much truth in the definition. But if an Irishman blunders occasionally, his blunders are of the head, never of the heart. If he have but little of the cool, calculating forecast of the Yankee, he is also exempt from many of the worst traits of character in the Yankee. He may be less shrewd and less thrifty; but he is not, for all this, the more selfish, or the less honest. Avarice is not a natural growth of the Irish soil, and of all vices in the whole catalogue, we believe there is not one which tends more to contract the heart, and to dry up the fountains of benevolence. Give us any other national vice rather than this.

We are not to be understood as implying that all, or even the more enlightened and better portion of our population, are infected with this unworthy prejudice against the Irish. Many of our greatest men and most enlightened statesmen are far elevated above this feeling. They take a wider and more expansive view of human nature; they soar up to regions of higher philosophy and purer philanthropy; their souls are too enlarged for any such narrow prejudice. They are Americans in the true and most comprehensive sense of the term. They appreciate excellence wherever they find it; they detest and rebuke vice, no matter what its origin. They look more to the man himself, than to the mere *accident* which gave him birth in a particular country.

We have already dwelt long enough on this view of the subject, and we conclude our remarks on it by a quaint quotation from that quaintest of all modern writers—Carlyle:

> "The sans-potato Irishman is of the self-same stuff as the finest lord lieutenant! Not an individual sans-potato human scare-crow, but had a life given to him out of heaven, with eternities depending on it: for once and no second time, with immensity in him, over him, and around him: with feelings that a Shakspeare's speech could not utter: with desires illimitable as the autocrat of all the Russias."

We can not attempt to go into lengthy details concerning the sufferings of Ireland under English misrule. The recital would fill volumes, and it has filled some of the most eloquent volumes that ever were written.[1] That sad story is familiar to the most of our readers. There is not one generous heart in the civilized world, which it has not touched in its tenderest chords and stirred to its very center. Oft has the poor exile from Erin, as he wandered a stranger in some distant and uncongenial clime, sat down and wept, when he remembered how the beautiful Island of his birth has been marred and made desolate by the hands of the oppressor; even as the captive Israelite of old once wept on the waters of Babylon, at the remembrance of the beloved Sion from which the arm of violence had rudely torn him, and whose glories had been scattered by the hand of the spoiler. It was a sad day for Ireland, when the Saxon first set foot on her green and lovely soil. It was for her the beginning of all her sorrows. Saxon misrule, continued through long centuries, has strewn her surface with ruins and desolation, in the midst of which a poor, miserable, starving peasantry, the children of the former lords of the soil, subsist and move along, like specters through desolate and abandoned castles. In the graphic language of Mr. Lester:

> "To a distant observer that beautiful Island appears like a city of ruins in the saddened light of evening. Her glory and her strength seem departed for ever. But it is not of the poetry of the past the lover of Ireland must speak. Her bards never sang in strains so mournful and pathetic as the sad lullaby of the mother over her famishing child. The complaint of poverty and the cry of suffering are more heart-breaking than her most plaintive melodies. Her woes and her dishonor move not the heart of her oppressors, but they are noted by the God of the poor."[2]

There is no crime, there is no enormity, which England has not committed towards Ireland. In speaking of English tyranny over the Irish people, we cannot find language strong enough to paint the sober reality;

---

[1] Among these the most eloquent perhaps, is the work of O'Connell: "A Memoir of Ireland, Native and Saxon."

[2] Vol. ii, pp. 74, 75.

exaggeration is entirely out of the question. Her treatment of Ireland, both in war and in peace, finds no parallel in that of the most rebellious and least favored of her provinces by pagan Rome herself, while in the heyday of her prosperity and in the full tide of her all-conquering and rapacious career. The penal code, which England adopted for the government of Ireland, would have disgraced the statute book of the grand Turk himself! No government, whether Christian, Mohammedan, or pagan, was ever sullied with more crimes, or marked with more utter baseness. Adroit diplomacy, low intrigue, base selfishness, insatiate rapacity, open treachery, high-handed spoliation and robbery, cold-blooded cruelty and persecution, and downright murder and butchery, have ever marked the policy of England towards Ireland, and exhibited to all the world the tender mercies of the English government towards its Irish subjects. O'Connell has proved all this by incontestable evidence, in his late Memoir of Ireland, and in his numerous letters and speeches. The two writers whose works we are reviewing have also established it, by an appeal to the history of Ireland under English misrule during the last seven centuries. Mr. Lester shows,

> "By a rapid survey of the past history of Ireland, that she is an invaded and plundered nation — that her degradation and her servitude are directly chargeable on England — that British cupidity and British pride have been the *alpha* and *omega* of Irish suffering."[1]

The first period of Irish suffering under English oppression extends from the first invasion of Ireland by Richard Strongbow, in the year 1168, to the time of the reformation, and embraces nearly four hundred years. It is marked by a fierce border war, and a protracted struggle for the ascendency, between the native Irish and the English invaders of the country. Ireland had never before worn a foreign yoke. The Roman eagles had never floated over the heads of her children. The hordes of invading Danes had been already broken and scattered by the valor of her patriotic troops. She was as free as the air of her own mountains; free as the strains of her own national harp. She had tasted the sweets of liberty too long, to submit quietly to the English yoke.

For more than four hundred years she sustained the unequal contest with her conquerors, nor did she yield one inch of her territory without a death struggle. More than once were the Irish septs on the point of finally triumphing and expelling the English from their borders, when some unhappy division in their own ranks, or some other untoward event, suddenly inclined the scale of victory in favor of England. But though overcome by superior force and tactics, yet did she never consent willingly to wear the fetters with which she was bound. Though downtrodden and a captive, her spirit was not broken: and she still fondly cherished visions of freedom.

Had England pursued a different and more liberal policy in regard to Ireland, this protracted war between the two races might have been much sooner terminated, by the fusion of the two into one people. This is admitted by a late English Protestant historian of Ireland, — Dr. Smiles of Leeds. We must present an extract from the preface to this work, as it confirms what we have said, and throws additional light on the period of which we are speaking:

---

[1] Vol. ii, p. 75.

> "In England and Scotland the conquering and the conquered races — Danes, Normans, Saxons, Britons, &c.—have, in a great measure, fused down into one people; but in Ireland the two races of the conquest are still at war, and after a resistance which has lasted for centuries, the struggle is almost as inveterate now as at the period of its commencement. The blame of this protracted and destructive enmity between race and race rests with the conquering classes themselves, as well as with the English government, which has supported them throughout in their anti-national and inhuman policy. Instead of amalgamating themselves with the nation, the Norman invaders, and afterwards the English and Scotch colonists who settled in Ireland, erected themselves into an ascendency of the most despotic and tyrannical kind. In course of time they possessed themselves of almost the entire soil of Ireland, treating the natives as helots, and slaves, and *with a cruelty which has never been exceeded in any age or country*. Laws were passed for the express purpose of keeping the natives distinct from the settlers, and thus preventing them from merging into one people. 'Mere Irish' were deprived of the protection of the English law, *and might be killed with impunity*. Statutes were passed expressly to prevent the English settlers from conforming to Irish language, dress, and manners, on pain of forfeiture of goods, and imprisonment, and being dealt with as 'Irish enemies.' And thus were the Irish people placed under the ban of proscription and exclusion by their conquerors, and a mark set on them to be shunned and hated by their fellow men."[1]

From the unexceptionable testimony of this candid English historian, we gather that the Irish were branded with infamy by the English, and declared aliens and enemies in the heart of their own country! This term *enemies* was, we believe, first employed in a statute passed under Henry IV.; and it is the only article of English law, as Moore the poet well remarks, to which the English have remained constantly faithful. More than once had the native Irish petitioned to be admitted to the rights of English citizenship; but their petitions were treated with contempt and scorn. They might be the slaves, they could not hope to become the subjects of England. This would have placed them under the protection of English law, and would have prevented the English lords of the pale from robbing them with impunity!

Goaded to desperation by these and similar acts of tyranny, the Irish septs often flew to arms; but each formidable insurrection was put down by an overwhelming royal army, which nearly always followed up the victory by wholesale massacre and spoliation:

> "At every insurrection came new troops of English adventurers who were in need of lands; and every poor and ruined nobleman sought to repair his fortunes in a country where murder and pillage gave a right to property."[2]

---

[1] Quoted in a late number of the Irish "Nation."

[2] Regnault—"Criminal History of the English Government," p. 13.

Outlawed in their own country, and hunted down by their enemies, after having been despoiled of their property, did the native Irish seek to fly from their homes and eke out a subsistence in some more genial abode on the continent? Even this mode of escape was precluded by the inhuman English law, which forbade "the Irish enemies to leave the country."[1] But, more and still worse than all this, a mark was set on these same *Irish enemies*, that any one, who was base and cruel enough to perpetrate the atrocious crime, might murder them with impunity wherever they might be found! For this unheard of and almost incredible wantonness of cruelty, we have the authority of the English statute book itself, and the express testimony of an unexceptionable Scotch Protestant historian—Sir James Mackintosh. He says: "During the dreadful period of four hundred years, the laws of the English government of Ireland did not punish the murder of one man of Irish blood as a crime."[2] We verily believe that the history of no nation on earth is stained with cruelty more wanton or refined than this; and we subscribe to Mr. Lester's opinion that "none but an English despot has the skill to carry the refinement of tyranny so far."[3]

The leading maxim of English policy in her government of Ireland, as well as the true secret of her success in retaining her hold on that ill-fated country, was: *divide et impera*—divide and rule. By intrigues and bribery, she set chieftain against chieftain, and sept against sept; she carefully kept alive the old feuds which had ever been the bane of Irish prosperity, and she thus brought about "the estrangement of those who should have stood shoulder to shoulder in the strife for common freedom. . . . . This has been her policy from first to last; and its successful application is all that prevents Ireland from taking her place among the nations of the earth."[4]

But sad and mournful as is the epoch of Irish history of which we have hitherto spoken; heart-rending and sickening as are its details, that period at which we must now rapidly glance is yet more afflicting, and is filled with still greater enormities. This might seem impossible, but it is even so. From the reformation, *so called*, down to the present time, a new and more exciting element has been infused into the political hatred which England had ever borne to Ireland. This new and bitter ingredient in the chalice of Irish suffering, was a fierce and relentless religious bigotry. England had crushed the bodies, she now meant to bow down or crush the souls of Irishmen! If English misrule was a bane to Ireland, English Protestant bigotry was a curse a hundred-fold greater and heavier, and more appalling in its consequences.

When England was violently severed from Catholic unity by the headlong passions and high-handed tyranny of Henry VIII., she sought to drag Ireland also into her schism and apostasy. The truculent and bloody tyrant, who had made himself head of the Anglican church, spared no efforts to induce Ireland to acknowledge his spiritual supremacy. Bribes and menaces, the sword and the bayonet, the rack and the gibbet, were successively employed for this purpose. But they were all unavailing. The great body of the Irish people still fondly clung to the faith of their forefathers, which had consoled and strengthened them in the midst of sufferings that had rarely, if ever, fallen to the lot of any other nation. They might be despoiled of their property, they might be branded as aliens and outlaws in the heart of their own dear country, they might suffer the death of traitors, or they might be massacred in cold blood; but no indignity or suffering could tear from their hearts the bright jewel of faith, which they so highly prized and so dearly cherished. They might lose all else, but they would still warmly press this treasure to their bosoms! England had never yet offered them one single blessing, which was not more than outweighed by its attending curse; and could they now be induced to receive the reformation as a boon from her treacherous and blood-stained hands? No, no; Ireland would not apostatize.

---

[1] Regnault—"Criminal History of the English Government," p. 13.

[2] Quoted by Lester: "Fate and Condition of England, ii, p. 71.

[3] Ibid. p. 80.

[4] Ibid. p 81.

This stern refusal to abandon the Catholic faith, and to subscribe to the new-fangled and ever changing religious notions of England, constituted Ireland's greatest crime. No language can adequately portray the refinements of cruelty, by which this crime has been visited by England for nearly three centuries. In the poignant bitterness of her sufferings during this period, the Irish Catholic almost forgot the many atrocities perpetrated in his country by the English, during the first four centuries of their domination. The annals of no country in the wide world, whether Christian or pagan, can present any thing half so cruel or atrocious, as that which is unfolded in the persecutions of the Irish Catholics by the English government since the period of the reformation. The facts almost stagger belief; and the recital makes our very blood freeze in our veins! This is admitted by Dr. Smiles, the candid English Protestant, to whose History of Ireland we have already referred. He says:

> "The records of religious persecutions in all countries have nothing more hideous to offer to our notice, than the Protestant persecutions of the Irish Catholics. On them, all the devices of cruelty were exhausted. Ingenuity was taxed to devise new plans of persecution, till the machinery of penal iniquity might almost be pronounced perfect."[1]

What are we to think of a penal code, which forbade Catholics to open schools for the education of their children; which set a price upon the heads of Irish priests, and hunted them down like wild beasts; which double taxed, ground down with unheard of extortions, and openly despoiled the Catholics of their property; which authorized the apostate son to drive his gray-headed father from the paternal roof, if he refused to turn Protestant in his old age; and which relentlessly pursued religious non-conformity with fines and imprisonment, with fire and sword? What are we to think of a policy, which necessarily induced ignorance and poverty, and then sneered at both? What are we to think of a system of legislation, which forbade a Catholic to own a horse worth more than five pounds, and authorized his Protestant neighbor to rob him of it by law, if he could prove before a justice of the peace that he had tendered five pounds for the animal and been refused? What are we, in a word, to think of a government which adopted the systematic policy, of first driving the Irish Catholics into revolt by intolerable exactions and cruelties, and then despoiling them of their property, and butchering them in thousands!

---

[1] Preface to his History of Ireland.

Yet this was precisely the policy which Protestant England pursued towards Catholic Ireland for centuries. And this explains to us the anomalous and otherwise unaccountable fact, that, whereas seven-eighths of the Irish people are still Catholics, more than *three-fourths* of the entire landed property of the Island is now in the hands of the Protestants. The great Irish Catholic chieftains and landlords were purposely goaded into rebellion, that they might be branded as traitors, and their lands confiscated for the benefit of English adventurers. Such was the course adopted towards Earl Desmond, a powerful chief of Munster; such also was the treatment of O'Neill, another wealthy and valorous Irish chieftain. When Queen Elizabeth heard of the revolt of the latter, she remarked to her courtiers, with a fiendish smile: "It would be better for her servants, as there would be estates enough for them all."

> "This single expression of Elizabeth," says Mr. Lester, "reveals the entire policy of the English government towards Ireland. That injured country was the great repast, at which every monarch bade his lords sit down and eat. After they had gorged their fill, the remains were left for those who should come after. Tranquillity succeeded these massacres, but it was the tranquillity of the grave-yard. The proud and patriotic Irishmen were folded in the sleep of death, and the silence and repose around the lifeless corpses were called *peace:*
>
> 'They made a solitude,
> And called it peace.'"[1]
>
> . . . "Often a great chief, possessed of large estates, was purposely driven by the most flagrant injustice and insults into open rebellion, that he might be branded as a traitor, and his rich possessions by confiscation revert to the English vampyres that so infested the land. Every cruelty and outrage that can dishonor our nature, was perpetrated in the unjust wars by English leaders and English soldiers. Cities were sacked, villages burned, women violated, and the helpless and the young slaughtered by thousands. A record of these scenes of crime and blood we can not furnish. It is written, however, on every foot of Irish soil, and in the still living memories of many an Irish heart."[2]

To exhibit the tender mercies of the English armies when they had succeeded in putting down a rebellion, which the persecuting and iniquitous policy of the English government had provoked, we may present the testimony of two cotemporary English writers, Hollingshead and the poet Spenser, concerning the desolation which reigned in the province of Munster after the defeat of Earl Desmond.

---

[1] Vol. ii, pp. 83, 84.

[2] Ibid. p. 82.

"This province," says Hollingshead, "which was heretofore rich, very populous and fertile, covered with green pastures, crops, and herds of cattle, is now deserted and barren; it bears no fruit; there is no grain in the fields, no cattle in the pastures, no birds in the trees, no fish in the rivers; in short, the curse of heaven (!) on this country is so great that you may pass through from one extremity to the other, and you rarely see a man, woman, or child."[1]

The poet Spenser, who received three thousand acres of land from the confiscated estates of Desmond, in compensation for his fulsome flattery of royalty, thus describes the scene which he witnessed on going to take possession of his estate in Ireland:

> "Out of every corner of the woods and glynnes they (the people) came creeping forth upon their hands, for their legs could not bear them. They looked like anatomies of death — they spake like ghosts crying out of their graves — they ate the dead carrion, happy when they could find them; yea, *and one another soon after;* insomuch as the very carcasses they spared not to scrape out of their graves; and if they found a plat of water-cresses, or shamrocks, to those they flocked as to a feast for the time, yet not able to continue there withal, that in a short space there were none almost left, and a most populous and plentiful country was suddenly left void of man and beast."[2]

These are but single pages in the long and sad history of Ireland's wrongs under English oppression. They are, however, pretty fair specimens of the whole work. England's policy towards Ireland has been very simple, steady, and uniform; and its practical effects on Ireland and the Irish people have been nearly the same for the last seven centuries. For almost two centuries immediately succeeding the reformation, the history of Ireland is a monotonous recital of tragedies and sickening horrors, such as those just described. The same means were employed in each successive reign, and the same dreadful effects followed. After having filled Ireland with desolation and massacre; after having cut off most of its heroes, murdered most of its chiefs, and sent her vampyres to seize on its richest lands, Elizabeth had a medal struck which bore the inscription — *Pacata Hibernia!* But Ireland was exhausted, not conquered; trodden in the dust, not *pacified.*

Ireland was destined to become the victim and the prey of each succeeding English dynasty. The Stuarts carried out the fiendish policy of the Tudors. They even added blackhearted ingratitude and treachery to open spoliation. Noble and generous Ireland poured out her blood in torrents for the two Charleses, and they betrayed her with a Judas-like kiss. Ireland fought bravely for the last and best of the Stuarts, James II.; and he, far from sympathizing with her in her devoted love, could only cry out in the memorable battle of the Boyne, when Irish valor was repulsing the English and their Dutch allies: "Spare, oh! spare my *English* subjects!"

From the accession of the house of Stuart to its expulsion from the

---

[1] Quoted by Regnault, pp 15, 16.

[2] State of Ireland—quoted by Lester, vol. ii, p. 92.

English throne — a period of more than eighty years, including the times of Cromwell and the commonwealth — Ireland was almost continually torn with dissensions and civil wars, pillaged by succeeding armies, and stained with the blood of her slaughtered children. Besides her own hereditary miseries, she was doomed to share in all the evils consequent on each political revulsion of the sister kingdom. Her fidelity to the Stuarts brought down on her devoted head the terrible vengeance of Cromwell, whose fanatical armies swept over her fair soil, like a swarm of Huns, spreading devastation every where, butchering the inhabitants in cold blood, and leaving only ruin, desolation, and the voice of wailing behind them. The terrible doings of these merciless ruffians, who wore long faces, quoted the Bible, and uttered long prayers, in the very same breath that they massacred the helpless widow and orphan, and imbrued their hands in the blood of the "papists," are still freshly remembered in Ireland; and the most withering malediction which an Irishman can utter, is that which invokes the "curse of Cromwell" on his enemy.

All who have read the history of Ireland will know that we have not exaggerated in the sketch just drawn, and that we have not done injustice to the unfortunate house of Stuart. The contemptible and pedantic James I., the first of that house who sat on the English throne, was the first British monarch who carried out the system of Irish spoliation on an extended scale, and by the chicanery of law; at a time too of profound peace, and without any provocation whatever. At the commencement of his reign, the earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel were declared, without a shadow of proof, to be agents in a grand Catholic conspiracy against English Protestant ascendency in Ireland. Their vast property, extending through six counties, and embracing five hundred thousand acres of land, was declared confiscated to the crown, and the base robbery was sanctioned by a subservient Irish parliament, to which James had caused creatures of his own to be returned. But this was not enough to satisfy the insatiate rapacity of the English monarch. We will give the energetic language of Mr. Lester on the subject:

> "His success in this king's robbery only whetted his appetite for greater spoils. But what new scheme could he devise by which to wrest from the Irish chieftains their estates, for even a villain's brain will become exhausted of plots. A commission was appointed 'for the discovery of defective titles.' A set of men called *discoverers* was employed to hunt up defects in the titles of landholders, who, of course, were rewarded in proportion to their success, or, in other words, a premium was given to the best informer. It was not difficult to find defective titles in a land that had for centuries been afloat in the turbulent waves of civil war, especially when witnesses were suborned for the purpose, and bribes and violence and tortures freely employed to wring the Irish estates from their lawful owners."[1]

We might fill a volume with atrocities like these; but we sicken at details so revolting; and we must hasten on. To the everlasting honor of Catholic Ireland be it said, that, though thus ruthlessly persecuted and trampled under foot by Protestant England, yet was *she* never stained with the crime of religious persecution! At three different periods of her history, Catholic Ireland regained for a short time the political ascendency; and she might then have repaid her spoilers and persecutors in their own coin. During the reign of Mary, at the close of that of Charles I., and at the time of the revolution that expelled James II. from the English throne, the Catholics of Ireland might have driven the English Protestants from the Island: but they made no attempt of the kind; — they shed not one drop of Protestant blood in the hallowed name of religion. Let the bigots who are for ever denouncing the Catholic Church for her persecuting spirit, and sneering at the "low and blood-thirsty Irish," remember this unquestionable fact, and blush — if they have not wholly lost the power of blushing! Generous and noble-hearted by nature, the Irish Catholics, at the first dawn of national prosperity, forgot the dark clouds which had so long hung over, and the terrible storms that had so often swept through, their devoted country; they forgave all past injuries, insults, and atrocities: and they nobly requited evil with good, curses with blessings. The sun did not set on their anger.

---

[1] Vol. ii, page 88.

What return England made for this generous forgiveness, we have already seen. But there is yet one bitter cup which she put to the lips of Ireland, to which we have not yet alluded. Not content with all her previous outrages, she let loose on Ireland a set of ruthless and truculent blood-hounds, who thirsted for her blood and rioted amidst her ruin and desolation. The Irish Orangemen were sworn to maintain the Protestant ascendency in Ireland, and, if need was, to wade up to their knees in Irish Catholic blood! For more than a century the whole power of England sustained this blood-thirsty faction; and the English government withdrew its support, only when the indignant outcry of the civilized world, seconding that of bleeding Ireland, compelled it to do so. The Orangemen were but the executioners of that iniquitous system which England had ever pursued towards Ireland,—of that fiendish policy which set Irishmen against Irishmen, scattered spies and informers over the land, and liberally rewarded every act of baseness and treachery. And a burning shame it is, that she always found Irishmen base enough to take the wages of iniquity, and meanly to sell their country's birthright for a mess of pottage. Division among Irishmen has ever been the greatest bane of that beautiful, but devoted Island.

Space fails us to speak of the noble exertions made by the men of 1782 for the regeneration of Ireland; of the brilliant, but alas! ephemeral success which crowned their efforts; of the victories achieved by the noble eloquence of Grattan; of the memorable "rebellion" of 1798, and of the dreadful consequences which ensued from it to Ireland. All these things are familiar to our readers. There is not an intelligent

Irishman in the wide world, whose soul has not been stirred in its deepest fountains by the familiar details of those glorious or terrible events. Throughout this whole period of Ireland's history, the English government continued to pursue its usual selfish and treacherous policy. If the demands of the Irish volunteers were granted, it was with an ill grace, and only because England, exhausted by war and terrified by the recent successful revolt of her American colonies, could not do otherwise than grant them. But so soon as she recovered from her temporary difficulties, she retrieved the *faux pas* she had made in her most approved style. She goaded the Irish into rebellion, then crushed them by brute force: and, while Ireland lay crushed and bleeding at every pore, she annihilated her national parliament by the odious "act of union."

This master-stroke of Pitt's policy "was conceived in iniquity and brought forth in sin." It was the death-blow of Irish independence and nationality. It laid Ireland prostrate at the feet of England. It permanently fastened the odious English ascendency on the necks of Irishmen. It marred the prosperity, crippled the commerce, ruined the manufactures, weakened the energies, and crushed the spirit of Ireland. It did more. It firmly established and greatly increased that detestable system of absenteeism, which annually drained Ireland of millions of her treasure, to be expended in England or on the continent. It bound Ireland hand and foot, and placed her wholly at the mercy of an overwhelming majority in the English parliament. Against the solemn faith plighted by England in the act of the union itself, it saddled on Ireland the enormous public debt of England. In a word, it enriched England at the expense of Ireland, and it overspread the latter country with pauperism and misery unutterable. The bill of Catholic emancipation, reluctantly passed by the English parliament in 1829, mitigated somewhat, but it did not remove, these crying evils. They still exist to an alarming extent and in an ever-increasing magnitude. England still has her foot on the bosom of prostrate Ireland, and English iron still enters the soul and pierces the very vitals of Irishmen!

XXIX. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.*

ARTICLE V.—ITALIAN SOCIETY.

Dickens and Kip—Superficial travelers—Writing for money—Lady tourists—License for gossiping—Character of Dickens as a writer—Baretti and Sharp—Italian contentment—Two extremes to be avoided in the social condition—Material comforts—Difference between the Italians and Americans—Laboring classes in Italy—Italian squalor—Mode of life among Italians—Their sprightliness—Vivacity of children—Italians a social people—Their amusements—Gambling—Horse races among them and us compared—Profane swearing—Temperance—General use of wine—Its effects on temperance and health—Politeness—Meekness among the great—Training of children in Italy—A gross charge against Italian morality refuted—The fashion of employing *Cavalieri Serventi*—How it originated.

We do not sit down to write a review of the two recent works on Italy, published by Dickens and Kip. They have already received fully as much notice as they deserved. The Dublin Review has administered a withering rebuke to Mr. Dickens, more, however, in sorrow than in anger; while the utter flimsiness, the manifold inconsistencies, and the glaring absurdities of the "Recantation" have been already sufficiently exhibited. Our purpose at present is, merely to take occasion from these publications to throw together some general remarks on certain leading features of Italian society; a subject little understood, and upon which there exists much popular misapprehension and no small amount of error.

The chief cause of this is, that our people have been too much in the habit of looking at Italy through a false medium, that of the peculiar political bias or religious prejudices of certain writers who have traveled in that beautiful country. These tourists usually give us a view of Italian manners and customs, not as they really are in themselves, but as they choose to apprehend them. They furnish us with their own hasty impressions, rather than with facts and data by which we might be enabled to reach a sound conclusion. We must either look at Italy through their spectacles, or not look at it at all. We must see just as much as they see, hear just as much as they hear, and feel just as much as they feel; neither more nor less. If they choose to treat us only to a mere bird's-eye view, or to an imperfect glimpse of the country from a coach window, we must be content with their productions, such as they are.

Besides, these men are, for the most part, utterly incapable of giving us a correct picture of Italian society. They are often totally disqualified for this grave task. They generally know little of the Italian language, and still less of Italian manners and feelings. They do not mingle much with the people, but are content to view them at a distance. Their associations are chiefly with their own set; with English or American travelers as ignorant, as frivolous, and as prejudiced as themselves. In such company, they stand aloof from the vulgar Italian crowd, imagine themselves beings of a higher order, dropped down from some upper sphere unto this lower earth; and, like the pharisee of the Gospel, they turn up their eyes to heaven, and thank God that they are not like the rest of men,—even as those despicable, "priest-ridden" Italians!

---

* 1. *Pictures from Italy.* By Charles Dickens.

2. *Recantation, or the Confessions of a Convert to Romanism;* a tale of domestic and real life in Italy; edited by the Rev. Wm. Ingraham Kip, M. A., author of the Christmas Holydays in Rome, &c. New York. 1846.

They visit Italy with their minds already made up, both on religion and on politics; and every thing they see and hear only tends to strengthen the conclusion already reached. They either do not see, or they cannot understand or appreciate, any thing that is opposed to their opinions already formed. Even if they should happen to stumble upon facts which would tend to stagger them in their preconceived theories, they usually take care to pretermit them, or to give them in some remote corner or note, for fear of shocking the prejudices of others, and thereby injuring the sale of their book. They never fail to keep a steady eye to business in all their movements, and especially in what they may conclude to publish on Italy. How will this incident, this picture, this anecdote, *take* with the reading community among whom my work is to be circulated? Will it jar with their cherished notions, or shock their religious and political feelings? If so, I must omit it altogether. Will it tickle their fancy, cause them to rub their hands with glee, and chuckle over the woful darkness and degradation of the "popish" Italians? It will do; it is the very thing; it must occupy a prominent place in the book.

Now, we do not mean to say that such reflections as these actually pass through the minds of *all* our Italian tourists, when on the eve of publishing their travels; still less would we say, that they are always fully conscious to themselves of this process of reasoning. Some there may be, who are entirely above these selfish considerations; many others there are, who would be ashamed to acknowledge such motives even to themselves. Still, our remark is not the less true, in the main, for all this.

Verily we live in a most enlightened age; that is, in one which is most specially enlightened in material interests and in the matter of dollars and cents. If we have not yet discovered the philosopher's stone, it has not been surely for the want of seeking after it with earnestness and assiduity. We labor to transmute every thing into gold. What matters it, if the reputation of our neighbors suffer, if falsehood be retailed for truth, if caricatures be vended for veritable "pictures" of real life?" So that the investment turn out a good one, and the adventure meet with a substantial return in the way of profits, it is all right. Truth, virtue, conscience,—every thing may be lawfully sacrificed on the altar of mammon. It is a reflection as sad as it is well founded, that many men of our enlightened day seem to carry their consciences rather in their pockets than in their hearts. Every thing for money; little or nothing for truth — seems to be at least a tacit motto in our age. And in this respect, however enlightened, we are certainly not peculiar. Pagan society was marked by a similar feature, from the days of Horace. POST NUMMOS VIRTUS — AFTER MONEY, VIRTUE;—was the prevailing maxim with the Roman youth of his epoch.

Should any one be inclined to suspect that our remarks are too severe, or too highly colored, we beg him to look, for one moment, at the general complexion of those books on Italy with which we have been regaled during the last few years. Are they really much better than an implied insult to the understanding of our people? Can we well conceive of any thing more thoroughly egotistical, more ridiculously empty and superficial, more devoid of all good taste both as to style and matter, than Headley's Italian Letters? In these respects, and in a dashing volubility and contemptible superciliousness, they are surpassed by nothing of the kind with which we are acquainted in our language; except, perhaps, by the earlier Letters of Theodore Fay, who was so thoroughly demolished some years ago by the late talented bishop of Charleston.[1]

If there is any thing in the language which is as utterly worthless as the publications of these two male tourists in Italy, it is to be found in the recent works of two female writers on the same subject, the one an American, the other an English lady: Miss Waldie's "Rome in the nineteenth Century," and the "Recantation," by an anonymous authoress. It is not for us, however, to deal harshly with these gentle writers. In the matter of gossip, of scandal, and of small talk, ladies have claimed certain privileges from time immemorial; and we would not, for the world, encroach upon their rights in this respect, or insist upon confining them strictly to dull matters of fact, when they can show off to so much more advantage in the higher and more graceful regions of fancy. Especially would we be inclined to gentleness towards them, when their motives are so religious and excellent;—to exhibit fancied error in all its native deformity, and suspected or alleged vice in all its natural hideousness! Far be it from us to carry out the suggestion of that heartless satirist, Hudibras, and

> "To scandalize that sex for scolding,
> To whom the saints are so beholden:
> Women who were our first apostles,
> Without whose aid we had been lost else;
> Women that left no stone unturned,
> In which the cause might be concerned."[2]

We can pardon much to ladies, who piously undertake to enlighten us on the subject of Italian darknesss and superstition. We even know how to make some allowances for Lady Morgan, who wielded a more masculine pen, and slew the Italians right and left, as with the club of Hercules. She probably thought that she was doing right well, and was exhibiting a singular dexterity in the ungracious undertaking of disparaging her neighbors: she knew at least that her efforts would be hailed with delight, and would gain her much additional fame, among her numerous English and Scotch admirers at home. Her anecdotes of Italian society were the very thing to suit the palates of her readers; gossip and scandal flowed from her pen with inimitable grace and volubility; her statements would pass unquestioned in the community,[1] and her hints and insinuations would be received with relish. Upon the whole, her fame would be enhanced by the publication.

---

[1] In a series of letters published in the United States Gazette.

[2] Part ii, canto ii, l. 773-8.

But what shall we say of Dickens? What of the inimitable London satirist, the idol of the English and American reading public, the steadfast friend of the poor and the scourge of the rich, the graceful and agreeable moralist, the author of the beautiful conceptions of Oliver Twist, Kate Nickleby, the Cheryble Brothers, and little Nell? What shall we say of his "Pictures from Italy?" In sorrow and in sadness of heart, we must say, that they are no pictures at all, but miserable and ill-natured caricatures. They have not one redeeming quality, not even that of literary merit, a high order of which had distinguished most of his previous writings. They are not the productions of Boz, but of another character altogether different. The good-natured, and laughing and high-toned champion of virtue down-trodden by heartless avarice, the exquisite transformer of virtue in a hovel and in rags into the ideal of all that constitutes loveliness, — has suddenly dwindled down into the contemptible London cockney abroad, dealing unblushingly in all the low slang and vulgar insinuation of his tribe. What a falling off!

The uniform gentleness and politeness of the Italians,—which even *he* does not dare gainsay,—is not sufficient to check his wayward humor, nor to remove the sting from his heartless satire. The classic reminiscences of the Italian soil, every foot of which tells a thrilling tale of by-gone deeds; the beautiful Italian churches, decorated with the most sublime works of the greatest artists that ever lived; the sweet melody of Italian music, unequaled in all the world besides; the reunion of all that is best calculated to call up stirring remembrances of the past and to awaken feelings of admiration for the present: — all this could not melt Mr. Dickens, nor turn him for one moment from his stern, preconceived purpose of libeling the Italians.

His "American Notes" were superficial and bad enough, especially that portion of them which was written after his disappointment at Washington city in obtaining the grant of an international copyright; but they are nothing in comparison with his "Pictures from Italy." His visit to America seems, in fact, — probably from the disappointment just alluded to, — to have changed his entire nature, to have disgusted him with the world, and to have filled him with settled chagrin. We wish heartily, for his own reputation, that he had stayed at home, and confined himself entirely to that department of literature for which alone he seems suited by nature and education, — to works of fiction. Whenever he ventures upon the field of sober realities, he is ill at ease, and is but too apt to revert to his old province of *fancy*. He was certainly *a stranger* in Italy; and he appears to have felt it himself.

---

[1] Not so, however, with all of them. She made one grievous blunder, which Dr. Wiseman took the trouble to expose. She stated that the venerable chair of St. Peter, kept in St. Peter's church at Rome, when examined at the time of the French occupancy of Rome, was found to bear an Arabic inscription! Dr. Wiseman proves conclusively that the chair she alluded to exists in Venice, not in Rome, and that it was a present made to the Doge in the middle ages, by some Mohammedan prince!

Why is it, that even the best writers have failed so signally in their portraitures of Italian society? Why is it, that almost all our writers on Italy, from the days of Addison and Sharp, down to those of Beckford and Dickens, have, with very few exceptions, turned out little better than mere Trolloping gossipers and contemptible retailers of slander? There must be some reason for this moral phenomenon, sufficiently ample to apply to the whole class. That reason we have already intimated. The writers alluded to did not look beyond the mere surface of Italian society; and they even looked at this but slightly, and with an obliquity of vision, which would have been wholly inexcusable in matters of much less moment than the character of an entire people.

A good work on Italy, one that would furnish us with correct and impartial information on the religious and the social manners and customs of that lovely country, is still a desideratum in our literature. We have met with no book of the kind, at least with no one which comes down to the present times. The work of Baretti, the famous Italian lexicographer and grammarian, comes the nearest to our notion of what a book on Italy should be. It is written with much ability and candor; it sets off the excellencies and the foibles of Italian character; it unfolds the general structure of Italian society; it embodies much valuable information on the material condition and resources of Italy, at the period when it was written. There is, withal, a vein of pleasantry pervading the work, which gives it a singular zest and piquancy. This humor is indulged in even on some matters which should not have been treated of with levity, — such as certain religious festivals and practices of the Italians, — and this is the principal defect we remarked in the publication.

It was written nearly a century ago in England and in English, and was intended as a reply to a book on Italy, by a certain Samuel Sharp, Esq., who had lately returned from his travels on the continent, and had given to the English public the result of his observations on Italy, in a publication which fully reflected the sour temper and morose malevolence of its author. We are sure that he must have been heartily laughed at by all the readers of Baretti's reply; and we think that any one who would republish the latter work, with such additions and modifications as would adapt it to our own times, would deserve well of our reading community, and would supply a want in our literature. The valuable "Classical

Tour" of Mr. Eustace,[1] and the sensible and generally impartial Letters of Mr. Brooks, together with the more recent Notes of Mr. Laing, not to mention many others, would supply the necessary information for making the requisite alterations in the revised edition.

But we must hasten on to the main object we proposed to ourselves in commencing this paper: the offering of some remarks on certain leading features of Italian society. Our observations will be necessarily very brief and summary. An entire volume, or rather several volumes, would be necessary to do full justice to a subject so ample, and withal so very interesting.

There are certainly some serious defects in the structure of Italian society; but there are also many transcendent excellencies. There are shades as well as lights in all true pictures of human life. The Italians are not, in general, so industrious and enterprising as the English or Americans. They love rest more, and locomotion less. They can be at rest, without being always in motion. They have not the same thirst for wealth as we have; that fever of avarice which makes the patient ill at ease and restless, and corrodes his very heart-strings, is not certainly an Italian epidemic. An Italian would be content and even merry, where an American would be miserable and in momentary apprehension of starvation. Give him but enough for to-day, and he sits down cheerful and happy, nor thinks of the morrow. The American lives on the future; the Italian on the present. The motto of the latter is that saying of our Lord: "Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof;" the motto of the former would seem to be: "No rest in this world."

The result is, that, whereas in Italy you often meet with individuals who have reached the verge of extreme old age, with scarcely a furrow on the cheek or a wrinkle on the brow,—hale, happy, and cheerful; in America, on the contrary, our men often become old ere they have passed the meridian of life. Many of our people literally work themselves to death; not indeed in manual labor, but in what is much more trying on the constitution,—the labor of the mind. Even our young men of business often look care-worn and in ill health, from excessive mental application and solicitude about growing suddenly rich.

It seems to us, then, that if the Italians are too careless about acquiring this world's goods, we are much too solicitous about them for our own comfort. If they incline to one extreme, we incline to the other. And it is difficult to decide which extreme is the worse. If true happiness consist rather in the constant and eager pursuit of wealth than in being content with what we already have, then is our social condition more conductive to happiness than that of Italy. If. on the contrary, it consist in the calm enjoyment of a moderate competency, without any over eager pursuit of more; in being satisfied with very little, and in being resigned even to want; then is the social condition of the Italians much preferable to our own.

---

[1] In four volumes 8vo. We are not aware that any American edition of this excellent work has ever been issued.

We freely admit, that so far as the *material* condition of society is concerned, we are greatly in advance of the Italians. We have, in general, many more worldly comforts than they. Our people are commonly better off in regard to the necessaries and luxuries of life. Food is more abundant, and wealth is more equally distributed among the masses. We have a country exhaustless in resources and boundless in extent, more than sufficient to supply all the wants of our comparatively scanty population. Our population, scattered over a territory much larger than all Europe, is not much greater than that which is crowded into the Italian peninsula and its two dependencies, the islands of Sicily and Sardinia; the whole superficial extent of which is not, perhaps, twice as much as that of one of our larger states. Confine our whole population to Italy, and we greatly doubt whether our people would be in a better condition than the Italians. With our "go-ahead" principle and restless temperament, we would certainly not be so content or happy as they are, were we placed in their situation.

Besides the Italians have not so many incentives to industry and enterprise as we have. Their social condition is fixed and immovable, and it has been so fixed for centuries. All the avenues of enterprise are already filled up; and a man there must, in general, be content with his actual lot in society. He cannot advance, and with ordinary industry, he cannot recede in the social condition. Hence he is usually satisfied to stay where he is, and does not kill himself with anxiety to ameliorate his position. The various trades and employments often descend from father to son for many generations. It is so, to a greater or less extent, in all old and densely populated countries. They have already reached the goal, towards which we are but tending.

Ameliorations in the social condition there may be, even in such old countries as Italy; but they are much more easily talked about than carried out. And we consider it very doubtful whether certain improvements, which our modern social economists are so much in the habit of extolling, would prove really beneficial to the mass of the Italian population. They would be apt to enrich the few at the expense of the many. A general system of manufactures, carried on principally by steam-power, would throw an immense number of the laboring population out of employment; and the competition among the laborers would be such as to reduce the price of labor down to the starving point. This has been long the case in England, and it would be so also in Italy under similar circumstances.

As it is, we have not a doubt that the Italian laboring population are, in general, as well clothed, as well fed, and as comfortable as most other European populations, without having their physical energies impaired by being over worked. The Italian climate is much more genial than that of England, and the Italian soil much more fertile and exuberant. Nature there pours into the lap of industry a more abundant return for labor; and an Italian may accordingly procure the necessaries of life with half the exertion, which would be requisite for the same purpose in a less propitious climate and with a less bountiful soil. This is a wise dispensation of Providence; for those living under a burning sun are necessarily more or less enervated in body, and therefore less capable of hard labor, than those living in a more northern latitude. This remark we have already made in a previous paper.

Notwithstanding all that has been written of the wretchedness and squalor of the Italians, it is nevertheless true, that famine and starvation, even great want, are of very rare occurrence among them. Bread, wine, oil, cheese, and other articles of daily consumption are so abundant, so generally diffused, and so very cheap, that all can procure them in sufficient quantity to support existence. In cases of partial failure of the crops, or other local misfortunes, public and private charity comes promptly to the relief of the suffering district, and thus the horrors of famine are averted. The Italian mode of living is very simple and economical. A few *bajocchi* (cents) in the pocket of an Italian laborer, will suffice to purchase ample provision for himself and family for a day. His wants are few and easily supplied. He will eat nothing but a bit of bread and cheese moistened with a glass of wine, and he will be merry and sing the live-long day. The Italians are almost all of them cooks, and almost all of them musicians. These two things often go together.

Contentment and sprightliness are among the most prominent traits in the Italian character. You will see but few long faces in all Italy. He who would be sad there, would present in his own person too strong a contrast with the radiant sky and balmy air over and around him. The Italians have a proverb,—"He who lives content will die singing,"[1]—which unfolds this national trait of character. If they do not actually die singing, they at least sing so long as they have life and health. The mother sings to her child, and the child sings to the mother, so soon as it becomes able to do so. The peasantry sing in concert while laboring in the fields, and the muleteer sings to keep himself company, or to cheer his wearied beasts of burden. The streets of the towns and villages, the mountain passes, the fields, are all vocal with music.

You cannot traverse Italy without feeling, even in spite of yourself, that the people are happy; and without also feeling indignant at those moody and splenetic travelers from a less genial clime, who, because they are not happy themselves, seem to envy the happiness of others, and seek to throw the pall of their own gloom over spirits, as gay and lightsome as the very birds which carol their merry notes amid the luxuriant Italian foliage. These sour tourists cannot appreciate a cheerfulness, which is a stranger to their own bosoms. Men who cannot feel happy, while rolling in wealth and reveling in abundance, cannot, for their lives, comprehend how others can be cheerful even in the midst of comparative indigence. Their fault is, that they judge of others by themselves,—often a very erroneous standard.

---

[1] Chi vive contento, muorra cantando.

During a residence of several years in Italy, we have been often struck by the sprightliness, vivacity, and merriness of the Italian children. While engaged in their rural sports, their eyes sparkle like brilliants, and their countenances are lighted up with an animation which bespeaks a high order of intellect and fancy, and tells how very happy they feel and are. Such eyes and such countenances are seldom seen elsewhere. If you wish to see childhood in all the attractive loveliness of its innocence, you must go to Italy. No where else, will you find the smile of youth so radiant; and no where else, except perhaps in France, is youthful light-heartedness prolonged to so advanced a period of life. The Italian of forty years has as much vivacity and buoyancy of spirits, as the Englishman or American of twenty-five. The haggard eye and the drooping visage, which tell of excessive mental anxiety and of anguish of heart, are almost unknown in Italy. They are, at least, as uncommon there, as they are common with us.

To what is this superior sprightliness of the Italians owing? As we have already intimated, it is owing partly to their religion, which naturally inspires this feeling; partly to their beautiful climate; and partly to their education and social habits. They have popular amusements, and sports, such as are almost unknown among us. In almost all the cities, towns, and villages, there are public gardens and walks, beautifully arranged and tastily laid out, to which all classes have free access. Here you will find immense multitudes, congregated together at evening when the labors of the day are over, and engaged in social intercourse and sprightly conversation. All orders of society are here seen mingling together, and in a relation of much greater equality than we would imagine possible in so old a society, the various grades of which are so fixed and so clearly marked. Such assemblages of all classes in the open air, for the purpose of innocent recreation and intellectual amusement, contribute greatly to the health, by promoting the habitual cheerfulness of the people. They are, moreover, picturesque, and present a singular diversity of grouping, which a painter would love to sketch. They bespeak also a high development of the social feeling.

In fact, an Italian cannot live without society. He is not and cannot be an isolated being. All his social feelings are not confined to the domestic circle; they seek and must have a wider scope. Throw a number of Italians together, and they must speedily become acquainted, they must talk, they must become cheerful and communicative. Their social feelings require this development, and without it they could not be at ease. You may travel from one end of Italy to the other; you may mingle with all classes of society, and you will seldom meet with one moody individual, reserved and shut up within himself, and unwilling to communicate his thoughts to his fellows. Such unsocial individuals do not flourish in the Italian soil; they belong to a *colder* climate.

Whatever opinion we may choose to form of this and other social habits of the Italians, we must admit that their amusements are, in general, very innocent; if we do not even come to the conclusion that they are very useful. We shall confine ourselves at present to such of them as are merely social.

Can any one, for example, reasonably find fault with the social assemblages above alluded to? We know of no one who would object to them, except, perhaps, certain gloomy religionists among us, who would seem disposed to shut out all earthly joy and cheerfulness from the human heart, and to measure a man's piety by the length of his visage. Many amusements which are very censurable in America, because they are often so grievously abused, may be, and generally are, very innocent in Italy, where no such abuse exists, at least to the same extent. The games of billiards, cards, back-gammon, and draughts, are innocent in themselves, and are blameable only when indulged in to excess, or turned to the purpose of gambling. This is but too often the case with us; it is not so in Italy. People there usually engage in these games for the sake of amusement only; we are but too apt to discard mere amusement and to turn every thing into dollars and cents. We would not say that gambling is wholly unknown in Italy; but we do say, and we say it advisedly, that it is not half so common there as with us. The reason of this is, that the social feeling is much stronger there than among ourselves, and the desire of wealth much weaker.

We have often felt indignation at those superficial, self-conceited, and malicious tourists, who, because they happen to see the Italians occasionally engaged in those games, immediately set them down as confirmed gamblers. These men, without taking the trouble to become acquainted with the social habits or even with the language of Italy, gravely charge the Italian people,—without any reason whatever and against all evidence,—with a grievous national vice wholly foreign to their habits, and against which their very nature revolts. They flippantly judge others according to their own low standard, and that of their own country, without reflecting that one material circumstance will alter a whole case. Such libelers should be at once branded with the indignation of all impartial men.

How very different, for instance, is an Italian horse-race, from one as it is conducted in our own country! With us it is a matter not merely of innocent sport, but very often of the greatest excitement, growing out of the deep stakes dependent upon the issue. It is one species of gambling, and one, too, which is often of the most exciting and dangerous character. Many men are ruined, and many make their fortunes on the race-course. Unworthy trickery is often resorted to in this, as in other sorts of gambling. Again, the race-course among us is but too often disgraced by profane swearing, by drunkenness, by quarreling and unworthy brawls. The case is very different in Italy. There the amusement is every thing; it absorbs all other feelings; drunkenness is wholly unknown; betting, especially in deep stakes, is exceedingly rare; rudeness and bitter feuds are seldom, if ever witnessed; while swearing, if heard at all, is confined to a very few of the most degraded and of the very lowest classes. An Italian of any standing in society would consider himself forever disgraced by the utterance of a profane oath. He shrinks as much — if not even more — from swearing at all, as do our gentlemen from swearing in the presence of ladies whom they respect. We repeat it, that in Italy racing and other amusements are a different thing entirely from what they are with us in America, or with the English. They are to be judged of by a different standard altogether. They are there part and parcel of mere social amusements; and the abuse of them is very rare indeed.

People must amuse themselves in some way, and if not permitted to indulge in innocent sports, they will often resort to those which are dangerous or positively sinful. In this country, we have no sufficient outlet for the popular feeling of sociability and cheerfulness. We have scarcely any popular amusements worthy of the name. What is the natural consequence? Our youth, in too many instances, unhappily betake themselves to low haunts of vice, and ruin their constitutions as well as impair their fortunes by dissipation. Is not this the case to a lamentable extent? Is such a state of things desirable, or is it consistent with sound morality? Would it not be far preferable to encourage innocent amusements in order thereby to avert those which are guilty? We think so.

In this, as in many other respects, we might profit greatly by the example of Italy, France, and southern Europe generally. Instead of reviling the character of the Italians, we might, with great advantage to ourselves, adopt such of their social practices as would suit the circumstances in which we are placed, and would be adapted to our character and wants.

In two things, particularly, we might learn a useful lesson from Italy; — in temperance, and in the suavity of social intercourse. These are very prominent and almost universal traits in the Italian character. You may traverse Italy from Turin to Naples, and you will, perhaps, not find one man drunk, or one who will give you an uncivil word. They all drink the light wine of the country; it is a part of their daily aliment; but they are seldom known to exceed the bounds of sobriety in drinking, or of temperance in eating. They seem to have an instinctive feeling of the point at which they should stop, and they seldom go beyond that point.

During a residence of more than four years in central Italy, though we saw thousands of people every day, we never witnessed but one instance of intoxication; and this solitary exception to a general rule, was a young soldier, who, having been sent out to procure the rations for his company, had indulged too freely in eating and drinking, and had made himself deadly sick, probably as much from the incompatible qualities, as from the quantity, of what he had taken. We saw many persons more than usually cheerful, even merry, from the effects of wine; we never saw more than one who was intoxicated. The Italians have in general no appetite for strong drinks; they are content with the product of the grape, which is fortunately very abundant in their beautiful country.

The general use of wine as an article of diet, rather than as a beverage, appears to be greatly conducive to the health, cheerfulness, and sobriety of a people. The Italians are an example of this. They are cheerful and sober. Dyspepsy is almost as much unknown among them, as is its invariable attendant,—melancholy. You will never find a people living in a wine country either sad or in bad health. And we are decidedly of the opinion, that if the cultivation of the grape were generally introduced into our own country, in which recent experiments have proved its entire practicability, the effect would be to banish the relish for strong drinks,—now *too common*, alas! among our population,—and to promote our general health and happiness. This measuer alone would probably do more to establish temperance among us, than all the temperance societies which were ever organized. It would strike at the very root of the evil, and furnish a radical cure.

Temperance societies are very laudable, but their influence is necessarily partial, even if it should prove to be permanent,—which remains yet be seen. The best temperance society would be one, which would promote the general cultivation of the vine. The example of all wine-growing countries is a sufficient proof of this. If our people must have stimulants of one kind or another, let them learn, like the Italians, to be content with that which is gentle, innocent, nutritive, and congenial to the human constitution. This is the only effectual means we know of to banish ardent spirits; the only one at least which has proved effectual elsewhere.

Politeness is a feature in the Italian character not less prominent than sobriety. This trait is common to all classes; you will seldom meet an exception to it. The poorest beggar, even when repulsed, will often invoke a blessing on him who has refused him an alms. The richest prince puts on no aristocratical airs when addressing the veriest peasant. Often have we seen and admired this trait of character in the Italian nobility. The mighty prince Borghese, owning a hundred townships, will frequently mingle with the rudest laborers whom he employs, on terms of social equality, and even of apparent intimacy. The Roman cardinal will hear the petition of the humblest citizen, and address to him words full of gentleness and kindness. The Roman Pontiff will waive all considerations of his exalted rank, to converse, in the tender accents of a father, with the poorest and most lowly of God's creatures. Whoever has visited Italy and been in Rome during the last few years, must have witnessed frequent instances of this noble and Christian condescension in the person of the highest dignitary in the Church. He might have seen Gregory XVI. stop his equipage, to converse with and console a poor woman, who had presented her memorial for the obtaining of some favor. He might have seen daily evidences of the deep love which the poor bore to that illustrious Pontiff. And it is well known that, in this respect, the present illustrious Pontiff, Pius IX., more than follows in the footsteps of his venerable predecessor. An Italian noble is known, not by his haughtiness and overbearing carriage, but by his superior gentleness and good breeding. He is a *gentleman*, according to the literal and original meaning of that word. What a contrast between the carriage and manners of the English, and of the Italian aristocracy! The former all dignity, and full of the pride of rank; the latter comparatively all humility and meekness.

There is also another striking feature in Italian society by which we might greatly profit,—the proper training of children. In Italy the parent impresses upon the tender mind of the child the duties of respect and obedience, and he does it so effectually, that instances of filial undutifulness are there rarely met with. In no country of the world, perhaps, is the parental and filial relation more fully understood or more properly appreciated. A disobedient child would there be considered as a monster, unfit for society. Popular sentiment would set the hot brand of indignation upon his forehead, and he would be cast forth as something unclean. Nor does the duty of filial respect and obedience cease at any particular period of life; the parent is always the parent, and the child is always the child, no matter what may be their respective ages or positions in society.

Is this the case with us? Alas! it is not, at least to half the extent. American parents love their children as fondly as do the Italian; but they do not often love them as well or as wisely. With us, the faults of the wayward child are but too frequently overlooked by the doating parent; if they are not even tacitly approved of, as evidences of a proper spirit, and of a talent which needs only a little time to develop it to proper maturity. The result of this over indulgence is, that the son or daughter is too soon emancipated from the parental control, becomes impatient of all restraint, and but too often plunges into the vortex of worldly vanity, if not of dissipation and vice. The afflicted parent finds out, when it is too late, that he has spoiled his child; and that the one, whom heaven gave him to be the solace and support of his declining years, is likely, on the contrary, to bring nothing but sorrow and bitterness on his gray hairs. It is not so in Italy, at least to the same degree. And the difference of result is chiefly owing to the difference of training. In this respect, as in many others, we might learn a useful lesson from Italian society.

There is, however, one charge against the morality of Italian society which we must briefly notice, as it has been made by several writers, and with some shadow of plausibility. It is alleged that the standard of female virtue is not so high in Italy as in many other countries of Europe; and in proof of this grave accusation, our attention is pointed to a peculiar feature in Italian society, which allows married ladies to have their *Cicisbei*, or *Cavalieri Serventi*,[1] who attend them on public occasions, hold their parasols and fans, recite verses and sonnets in their honor, and perform various other offices. Prejudiced writers on Italy profess to see in this custom a violation of all female decorum and propriety; and they take occasion from it to slander the virtue of the Italian ladies generally.[1] Never was there, perhaps, a more palpable instance of gross ignorance in regard to all the features which mark Italian intercourse, or of that unmitigated malevolence which construes everything into crime, than is implied in this scandalous imputation. Those who make the charge can scarcely be supposed to believe it seriously themselves.

---

[1] Cavaliers in attendance.

What! Are we to believe that an enlightened people, and one so proverbially jealous of female virtue as the Italians, would tolerate for one moment a systematic corruption of morals which would sap the very foundations of all society, by marring all domestic bliss, and breaking up the bonds of the family circle? Are we to believe that Italian husbands would sit quietly by, and see all their dearest interests sacrificed, and their most cherished affections blighted? Those who think so, know little of human nature, and nothing whatever of the Italian character. The thing is absurd, impossible on its very face. It were almost impossible even among savages. The malignity and utter groundlessness of the charge are transparent. When the splenetic and malicious Samuel Sharp, Esq., preferred this same accusation about a century ago, Baretti published a triumphant refutation of it, and administered to the libeler of Italian female character an indignant rebuke, which even *he* must have felt, if he had any feeling left.

We are ourselves no admirers of the custom in question, which we believe was always confined to ladies of the higher ranks, and has for many years past fallen into almost total disuse even among them. But no reasonable man can believe for one moment, that there ever was anything more in it than a mere matter of fashion, the reputed tendency of which was to enhance the importance, by increasing the suite, of those ladies who moved in the most fashionable circles. It was only a remnant of that chivalric gallantry of the middle ages, which lingered longer in Italy and Spain than in any other countries in Europe. After having declined for many years, it fell at last under the well aimed shafts of Italian satire. The poet Parini seems to have given it the finishing stroke.[2] Absurd you may call it, if you choose; grossly immoral in its tendency and effects it could not have been: else it is impossible to conceive how it could have been at all tolerated, especially among the sensitive and jealous Italians. They are naturally a highly poetical and imaginative people, who have adhered with much tenacity to their ancient social customs, more particularly those which carried them back to the days of mediæval chivalry.

We would, in short, make a most grievous mistake, if we should attempt to judge the Italians by our own more prosaic and matter-of-fact principles. We believe that there are few countries in the world where female virtue is more highly prized or more generally practised than in Italy. If you wish to be pointed to countries where this "index virtue" — as Mr. Laing calls it — is more generally lost sight of, you must go farther north; to Prussia, to Sweden, and to England. One thing is certain,— and it is conceded by our adversaries themselves,— that Italian parents are in the habit of watching over the virtue of their daughters with a singular care; and it is often made a matter of accusation against the former, that they will not permit the latter to mingle in society, but keep them shut up in the convent schools and academies until they are marriageable.

---

[1] This accusation is made particularly by Miss Waldie in her "Rome in the Nineteenth Century."

[2] See Alfieri's Autobiography, pp. 128–9, note American Edition.

XXX. CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT COUNTRIES.*

ARTICLE VI.—BRAZIL AND THE BRAZILIANS.

Interest of the subject—Qualifications for an impartial traveler—Misrepresenting Catholic doctrines and practices—Missionary tourists—Mr. Kidder's misstatements—The Brazilians *adoring* images—Absurd blunders—Fire-works on the "Sabbath"—Service of the holy week—Decoration of Brazilian churches—Religious emblems and names—Our Lady of the Snow—Homicides in Brazil and among us—Distributing tracts—A bright youth—The Bible in Brazil—Extracts from it read in the public schools—"The Bible never proscribed in Brazil"—Inquisitorial censorship—A trick of the Bible society—The Brazilians liberal and tolerant—The Catholic clergy—Slavery in Brazil—Touching practices of piety among the slaves—The religious Brotherhoods—The charity hospital at Rio—Is there any native party in Brazil?—Failure of Mr. Kidder's mission—His return home—Advantages of clerical celibacy.

Few countries are more interesting than Brazil; concerning few are the sources of information which are accessible to the American reader more shallow and unsatisfactory. Mr. Kidder has attempted, and with some success, to supply a great deficiency of which we, in common with many others, have long been deeply sensible. The very name *Brazil* calls up agreeable and poetic associations. It tells of a country of beautiful rivers and magnificent harbors, of splendid cities and cheerful people, of lovely flowers and smiling valleys, of rare plants and gigantic vegetation, of warm sunshine and warmer hearts. We confess that, from our boyhood up, we have always thought of the El Dorado whenever we heard the name of Brazil uttered; and, even now, there is no place in the new world we would be more delighted to see than Rio de Janeiro.

To be able to judge of a country correctly, a man should be almost more than human. If he should not have dropped down from the clouds, he should at least divest himself of all narrow prejudice, and become a citizen of the world, in the most enlarged sense of the term, ere he can rightly appreciate the character of a strange people. Unless his heart be as wide as the world, he will be but too apt to judge the new people among whom he may travel by the contracted views which he formed when under his father's roof, or while breathing the air of his native hills or valleys. To love our own country above all others, and to think its people greater and better and happier than any other, is a natural feeling, which may be either a virtue, or at most a very excusable weakness; but to push this sentiment so far as to conceive a contempt for all other nations, whose people do no exactly agree with us in constitutional temperament or social life, in legislation or religion, is certainly something more than a mere infirmity. It is an evidence of silly pride and narrow-minded prejudice. The traveler in foreign lands should surely leave all such ideas at home; at least, if he take it into his head to write a book, he should not inflict his own contracted and erroneous views on his readers, who look more for agreeable narrative and solid information, than for the peculiar notions or first impressions of the writer.

---

* *Sketches of Residence and Travel in Brazil, embracing Historical and Geographical notices of the empire and its several provinces.* By Daniel P. Kidder. In two volumes, with illustrations. Philadelphia: Sorin & Ball. London: Wiley & Putnam. 1845.

And yet how difficult it is to get rid of this narrow prejudice; and to become really a citizen of the world! How difficult to institute an impartial comparison between our own people and those of other nations, whom we consider less favored! How apt are we to look only at the dark side of the picture in a strange land, and to compare it with the bright side of that in our own dear country! Though extensive travel tends to expand our ideas and to liberalize our views, yet there are some men whose views are never expanded; and who, for all the good traveling does them or others, might as well stay at home.

We are not inclined to set down Mr. Kidder in this class of unteachable travelers, except where the religion of Brazil was opposed to his own settled prejudices. We have read his Sketches with great interest and pleasure, and we really believe that, with the exception just indicated, he sought to be impartial and accurate in his statements. We are indebted to him for much valuable information on the present political and financial condition of the Brazilian empire; as well as for an interesting synopsis of its past history, and a pretty fair estimate of its population, resources, literary and charitable establishments, great men, and future prospects. We are the more grateful for all this, as we had never before seen any work on Brazil, in which the attempt to portray the institutions of the country had been so full and successful.

Yet we much regret to say, that Mr. Kidder's work is often greatly disfigured by religious prejudice, and not unfrequently marred by positive misrepresentation. We could not, of course, have expected that, being a Protestant, he would have written as a Catholic; but we certainly had a right to expect that one so well informed and so liberal in other things, would not have betrayed so much ignorance and bigotry in regard to the Catholic religion. And it will be our duty, as reviewers, to notice some of the more striking among these exhibitions of an illiberal spirit. In discharging this office we intend "not to set down aught in malice," but, at the same time, to speak plainly, whenever the subject may seem to require it. We are heartily tired of being compelled every day to expose misrepresentations of our religion, made by men who should have known better, and who can plead no excuse whatever for their ignorance or malice. The doctrines and practices of Catholicity are not hidden in a corner; they are not of yesterday; they have been boldly and unequivocally set forth to the whole world for eighteen long centuries, during fifteen of which those sectarians who now think proper to cover them with obloquy had not yet sprung into existence!

Mr. Kidder went to Brazil with his religious notions already formed, and with a predetermination not to be pleased with any thing not conformable to them. He went with a settled conviction that the Brazilians were sitting "in the region of the shadow of death," and that it would be a great mercy to endeavor to shed some light on their darkness. He went as a hired agent of the Methodist Episcopal Missionary Society, for the purpose of distributing Bibles and tracts among the benighted papists of Brazil; and, of course, it was his obvious interest to represent them as ignorant, as priest-ridden, as dark on the subject of the Bible as possible. We are quite confident we are doing him no injustice; we have traveled ourselves in Catholic countries; we have had for several years full opportunities of comparing what we knew to be the truth, with the false or miserably perverted statements of those very men of God who belong to Mr. Kidder's school; and we have come to the deliberate conclusion, that little or no reliance is to be placed on the statements of any among them all, whenever the Catholic religion is concerned. The notable "Memoranda of Foreign Travel" by the Rev. R. J. Breckinridge, the "Letters of Rev. Mr. Cheever," and the "Sketches of Brazil," — to say nothing of a hundred other books of the same kind with which our country is literally flooded,— are, all of them, little better than base libels on the religious character of the various people, among whom those Reverend missionaries temporarily sojourned.

But, after all, these devout emissaries do some good, not only to themselves, but incidentally at least to others. They encourage the publishers, and they spread out among the people some wholesome knowledge, cumbered though it be with much misrepresentation and prejudice. The truth sometimes peeps out from their pages almost, in spite of them; and they not unfrequently, in the most simple and good-natured manner imaginable, let out the secret of their own utter failure in the holy enterprise upon which they had embarked,—with a good round sum for an outfit, and high annual wages to console them in their labors. We shall see that Mr. Kidder does this; but before we come to this feature in his book, we must spread out before our readers some of the glaring evidences of his ignorance and prejudice, in regard to the religion of the Brazilians.

He deliberately repeats the silly and exploded falsehood, that the Brazilian Catholics are in the habit of *adoring* images! Thus he says, speaking of what he saw in the convent of St. Antonio at Rio: "The *adoration* of images was, *of course*, a prominent topic of remark."[1] "Of course" it was! Had not his grandmother told him, while he was yet in the nursery, that all Catholics adore images? And was not the mere presence of images in Catholic churches sufficient evidence to *his* mind to confirm this grave accusation? "Of course" it was! How could Catholics be supposed to have common sense enough, to distinguish between a bit of canvass or a piece of marble and the living God of heaven and earth? Shade of Raphael! how you would stand aghast at the prodigious acumen and taste of this modern tourist! Had he but invoked you, he might have received some information as to the emblematic meaning of those streams of blood issuing from the five sacred wounds of the Saviour, and descending "to a figure beneath, in the posture of devotion," which he saw represented in a painting in the same convent, and the explanation of which, he says, none of the good monks could give him![1] Probably they thought him an unfit subject for instruction, or they smiled at his ignorance, and were too polite to undeceive him; else they might have told him that those streams indicated the saving influence of the blood of Christ on the fervent Christian. Had he possessed but a very reasonable share of penetration, he might have found out this of himself without the trouble of asking.

---

[1] Vol. i, 186.

A very moderate acquaintance with the Catholic Catechism and Church Calendar would have prevented him from exposing his ignorance on many other points, in which a Catholic child of ten years could have set him right. Thus he says, in the first volume, that Mass was celebrated during the hours of the evening;[2] and he had not grown a whit wiser when he reached the middle of the second, for he there made the startling discovery that a Catholic "novena is *a service of nine Masses* performed on as many successive days," and very late in the evening too, as the sequel of the passage shows![3] The veriest old woman in Brazil could have told him, that Mass is universally celebrated in the morning, and generally at a very early hour, as the officiating clergyman must be fasting; and we venture to say that, if his Sketches should ever be republished in Brazil, all the Brazilian women and children would indulge in a hearty and good natured laugh at his expense, for having supposed the Mass and evening devotions of the Lenten season identical; and the laugh would have grown louder and merrier when they would have found out, that our traveler actually identified the Mass with the popular festivals celebrated by the people in some localities with fire-rockets, illuminations, and other demonstrations, amid the thickening darkness of the evening! Mr. Kidder would really do well to study our religion, at least a little, before he undertakes again to travesty its worship and to caricature its observances: he should do this, even if it were only for his own sake, and to avoid making himself ridiculous.

By the way, his nerves were dreadfully shocked by the sound of those same fire-rockets let off in a popular festival, probably of the patron saint, at Parahiba; and,—oh! horrible desecration! on the evening of the Sabbath day! We will present an extract, for the double purpose of making our readers acquainted with the author's exquisitely delicate feelings on the subject, and of laying before them his description of certain popular sports which the church authorities have thought proper to tolerate, in connection with religious festivals in certain parts of Spanish and Portuguese America, to which we believe they are peculiar.

"I was induced to walk out in the evening to witness what was thought could not fail to be deeply interesting. The Matriz church, at which the fête was held, was situated near by. It stood at one end of an oblong area. Its front was illuminated by candles hung in broken lanterns around the door, and burning before an image in a nitch attached to the cupola. Large fires were blazing in different parts of the area. Around them were groups of blacks, eager to fire off volleys of rockets at appropriate parts of the service that was going on within the church. After the novena was finished, all the people sallied out into the campo to witness the fire-works. These commenced about nine o'clock, and continued, I was told, till after midnight. . . . . One of the most painful impressions of the scene arose from seeing whole families, including mothers and their daughters, out in the damp air to gaze upon spectacles not only partaking of the most low and vulgar species of the ludicrous, but having a decidedly immoral tendency — and all this under the name of religion! I was glad to retire as early as those who accompanied me would consent to go, resolving never again voluntarily to witnesss such profanations of the Sabbath.'"[1]

---

[1] Vol. i, 157.

[2] Vol. i, 122.

[3] Vol. ii, 184, 5.

The godly man! We almost fancy that we see him retiring in disgust from the vulgar crowd of publicans and sinners, assembled to amuse themselves with fire-works on a popular feast-day, after the religious services were over in the church; and hastening to his chamber, there to raise his pure eyes and hands to heaven, "to thank God that he is not like the rest of men," and "to resolve never again *voluntarily* (!) to witness such desecrations of the Sabbath: that is, we suppose, unless some ungodly Brazilian papist should take it into his head to drag the Reverend man to the scene of the festival, and to have his eyes propped wide open, so that he could not avoid looking on such popish abominations; then indeed it would be an *involuntary* act, and there would be no remedy except in submitting or dying a martyr,— which alternative seldom falls to the lot of our enlightened modern missionaries! And so it was a profanation of the Sabbath to fire off rockets on that holy day — though there is no Scripture against it that we know of — and it was no profanation to turn Pharisee on that day, to sneer at the neighbor, and worse still, to slander his religious character! How some people will "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel!" Now we do not like any profanation of the Sunday or Lord's day, — very pharisaically called the *Sabbath*, though the Jewish Sabbath has long since been done away with; — we love to see it kept holy as much as our brethren; but we cannot, for the life of us, see why our faces should be particularly lengthened on that day, or why we should grow sadder. Is it not a day of rest from toil, and also a day of rejoicing for the resurrection of our Lord? We confess we are not at all partial to fire-works on the Sunday, and they are certainly no part of our worship, nor is their use at all general in Catholic countries; but we are free to avow the conviction, based upon a careful examination of *both* sides of the question, that where all popular amusements are suppressed, and the pall of death is spread over the people on Sunday, there is really less piety and more vice, than where some innocent popular sports are tolerated, when these are purified and elevated by religion. How does a very large portion of our own population in this great Bible land spend the Sunday? Do one half go to church on that day? Are the coffee houses, taverns, and gambling establishments empty? We rather think not. And how do some of our holiest people spend their Sunday evenings? Are unworthy gossip and foul slander of their neighbors not among their ordinary amusements? We opine that these are much worse than even fire-works. How we do detest and abhor the hollow hypocrisy and canting pharisaism of the day! Rather place our lot with the publicans and sinners who shoot crackers on Sunday, than with such saints as these!

---

[1] Vol. ii, 185-6.

We could not, of course, expect that a man so spiritual and so enlightened as Mr. Kidder should at all relish the Catholic ceremonial, or be impressed with its splendor and dramatic effect, especially during the holy week. To be sure, that magnificent worship has riveted the attention and excited the admiration of the greatest men of every age for long centuries back, without any distinction of creed or country; but the genius of our missionary throws all those great personages in the shade, and sets them down in the vulgar herd of the untasty and unenlightened. He would be much too holy, perhaps, to admire the *Miserere* of the Sixtine chapel, the chant of the Lamentations, or the *Stabat Mater* of Rossini,—services which have long drawn tears from the eyes, even of men whose hearts were steeled with prejudice against Catholicity. But what were they to Mr. Kidder! Listen to his closing remarks on the religious ceremonies at Rio during the holy week and on the great festivals, which, he intimates in another place, are almost as splendid as those of Rome itself:

> "Amid the noise and confusion, the mirth and the parade of all these 'glorious,' 'splendid,' and 'pompous' celebrations, he must be a singularly devout man who can find any room for spiritual worship, not to say any incitement to it."[1]

He does not think proper to tell us whether he was one of those singularly devout men, who could be spiritual, in spite of all these carnal works, but he leaves us to guess it out for ourselves; though it requires no great shrewdness in the art to know which way he would have us think. Well, to oblige him, we will allow that he was eminently spiritual and eminently unimpressible, as well as a shrewd reckoner in matters of dollars and cents. He is almost as much shocked at the *expense* of these religious services, as he was at the fire-works. How stupid those popish Brazilians, for not having given to him for his Bibles the large amounts they yearly expended to decorate their splendid churches, and to keep up their grand ceremonial! How he would have liked to change slightly the wording of the following passage, which he quotes with implied censure from a discourse or report made by the president of a Brazilian province!

> "It is a matter of the very first necessity to put in proper repair our mother churches, and to give *all possible splendor to divine worship*,[2] not merely as a duty, but as a means of giving the sublime principles of relig-

---

[1] Vol. i, 156.

[2] The italics are his.

ion more influence over the imagination, over the public morals, and consequently over the happiness of the state."[1]

To the honor of the Brasilians be it said, that they are a peculiarly religious people, even according to the showing of our prejudiced author. Their churches are beautiful and often splendidly decorated; their minds and hearts lead them to religious observances; and even their sports are interwoven with religion. You will see religious emblems and the sacred cross everywhere, — in churches, in convents, in the streets, on the public highways. The names of towns, rivers, and provinces, are often religious. Mr. Kidder is scandalized at this system of nomenclature. He would greatly prefer the old pagan names of the aborigines to these names of saints;[2] he says it would be in decidedly better taste: he means, of course, that it would be more in accordance with *his* taste, and he certainly ought to know. We will not quarrel with him for this; if his tastes are more pagan than Christian, be it so; he may be for all this the better qualified to be a missionary among the Brasilians!

He would have done much better, however, had he kept his ignorance to himself, when he asked a Brazilian to tell him what was meant by the festival of *Nossa Senhora des Neves*, or our Lady of the Snow;[3] for had he but opened the first prayer-book he met with, he would have discovered that this festival occurs on the fifth of August, is one of the most remarkable and well known in the year, and is in commemoration of the snow which, according to a very old and respectable tradition, fell in Rome on that day to designate the site of the old Liberian basilic, now St. Mary Majors. Again, had he calculated less upon the credulity of his readers, he would not probably have insulted their understandings with the nonsensical account of the manner in which the ants were once excommunicated in Brazil, which account he copies, as he does much other similar stuff, from that veracious court hireling, Southey![4] And had he taken a few elementary lessons in Catholicity from some old lady in Brazil, he would probably have understood something about the meaning of the ceremonies used in Catholic baptism, and he would not have indulged in the gross ribaldry which disgraces his account of a baptism at Rio.[5] Finally, had he only reflected that, in the matter of stabbings and homicides, we free citizens of this glorious republic have made at least as much progress as any of our neighbors, even in Spanish America, we would probably have been spared his comments on the murderous disposition of the people in a certain province of Brazil;[6] for he might have apprehended a retort, which would have forcibly reminded him of the old proverb about throwing stones at others from glass houses.

Mr. Kidder's mission to Brazil, as we have already seen, was to distribute Bibles and tracts among the benighted papists of that empire. What success attended his enterprise for the conversion of the natives thereabouts, we shall see presently. He certainly succeeded, to some extent in scattering Bibles and tracts over the country; and we need not be surprised at this when we reflect that he often made the distribution with very little discrimination. Thus he gave a tract to a man whom he afterwards discovered to be an arrant thief;[1] and another to a boy who could not read a syllabie.[2] This boy, by the way, must have been a particularly bright youth, and our author accordingly treats us to a conversation which he had with him. As he appears to present him as a sort of specimen of the Brazilian lads in general, we will quote the conference, which our readers will find interesting and conclusive enough:

---

[1] Vol. i, 144.
[2] Vol. i, 264.
[3] Vol ii. 184.
[4] Vol. i, 266
[5] Ibid. 172.
[6] Vol. ii, 185.

"Have you any school in this vicinity?
Yes, one.
Where is it?
In the palace.
How many attend it?
Don't know; about three benches full.
Do you go at present?
No; I finished last year.
Do you know how to write?
No, nor to read either.
What then did you learn at school?
Nada! nothing at all!"[3]

Now this reminds us of a conversation we once had with a very bright youth whom we met, not in Brazil nor in any other "popish" country, but in this our own glorious native land of freedom and of open Bibles. The lad looked to be about thirteen years old; and after the preliminary civilities were over, we ventured to ask him: "My good boy, what is your name?" He opened his eyes and mouth very wide, as if the question had puzzled him not a little, and, after having duly scratched his head, probably to set his ideas in motion, he answered in these identical words: "*I ha'nt got no name; but they's gwine to call me Jim Russell!*" We were not a little amused at the adventure, but we never once dreamed of giving *him* as a specimen of our youth; and had we had a bushel of tracts, we should probably have thought it premature to entrust one to his keeping. And yet it is out of such materials as this, that our hired traveling missionaries in "popish" countries manufacture the most touching portions of their books.

We have read with great interest whatever Mr. Kidder says in reference to the distribution of the Bible in Brazil; and we will here present some reflections which struck us with force at the time we were perusing his "Sketches." Of course, when he makes an admission against himself, especially in connection with his darling scheme of scattering the Bible over the country, the reader will see it was wrested from him by the most stubborn evidence of truth alone; and he will be even inclined to suspect that there was probably something more than he dared acknowledge. It is hard for a man—even for as holy a one as our author—to admit a thing which makes against a favorite theory closely connected with his own interest.

---

[1] Vol. i, 163. [2] Vol. ii, 131. [3] Ibid.

He admits that Bibles were sometimes met with even in "popish" and benighted Brazil! Thus he fell in with a military captain, near Olinda, who informed him "that Bibles were sometimes met with in his vicinity, and that he had one in his family."[1] And this, be it remembered, was far away in the interior of Brazil. Thus, also—would you believe it, gentle reader?—he actually found that Bible extracts were used in the public schools at San Paulo,[2] for the purpose of teaching the children to read. Speaking of this school, he says:

> "The school was decidedly the most flourishing that I saw in the empire. It registered one hundred and fifty-six as scholars, most of whom were white, but a sprinkling of mulattoes and colored lads among them gave variety to the appearance of the company. The several classes answered the questions addressed to them in a sprightly and intelligent manner, giving evidence of good improvement. The Lancasterian system was in full operation; but the most pleasing circumstance I noticed was that cards, *exhibiting extracts from Scripture, were used in teaching the children to read. Very appropriate lessons had been selected*, according to the capacity of the little readers, and could not fail to exert a most happy influence over their heart as well as mind."[3]

To the same effect is his admission, that the Bible was not excluded from one of the principal colleges of Rio Janeiro. Speaking of one of its public exercises, he says:

> "When all were appropriately seated, the director opened the exercises of the day by standing up and *reading from the Bible* five verses of the eighteenth chapter of Matthew. Then passing the Bible into the hands of the monitor general, the company were invited to kneel, while the monitor recited the prayers of Solomon at the dedication of the temple. 1 *Kings* viii, 23–54."[4]

Nay, more; he makes the painful avowal that, after all that has been said by the "no-popery" zealots about the opposition to the circulation of the Bible in the vernacular tongues by Catholic countries in general, and by South America in particular, the Bible was never proscribed in Brazil! True, he qualifies the admission in various ways; he seems to writhe with agony while making it, as if he feared to hurt the feelings of his employers, and to scandalize his dear readers; he wraps it up in an envelop of ambiguous, we had almost said, disingenuous language; but it is still there, clearly put down in his book:

> "In fact, *although the Bible had never been proscribed in Brazil*, otherwise than in the usual regulations of the Romish church (!!), yet in the lack of all effort on the part of the priesthood to give it currency, it was, so far as the vulgar tongue was concerned, an effectually concealed and unknown book. . . . . But Portugal had never published the Bible, or countenanced its circulation, save in connection with notes and comments that had been approved by inquisitorial censorship!"[5]

That is, plainly, the Bible in the vulgar tongue *never was proscribed in Brazil;* and even Portugal, the mother country, published it, and countenanced its circulation, provided it had some approved explanatory notes annexed. The Catholic discipline requires this latter condition, lest, as St. Peter warns us, "the unlearned and the unstable (the bulk of mankind) should wrest it to their own perdition;" as those very Bible men do, by extracting from it a thousand contradictory systems, quarreling continually about its meaning, and then boasting of their love of it, and sneering at that venerable Church from whose hands they originally received it, and which alone has always been uniform and consistent in its interpretation! Do not our Bible and tract societies exercise an "inquisitorial censorship" over the works they publish, the Bible itself not excepted? Did they not *expurgate* D'Aubigné's Reformation, and when a clamor was raised among their own co-religionists about that *expurgation*, did they not acknowledge that they were *in the habit* of serving most of the works they published in the same manner? Do they not continually put in requisition their "inquisitorial censorship" in deciding upon what version of the Bible they should print; and have not the Baptists threatened to leave, or actually left them, because they would not publish translations to suit the peculiar views of their sect? Yea, more; did not this same Bible Society, some years ago, publish a Spanish Bible with a glaring forgery and falsehood on its title-page, which stated that it was a reprint of an old and approved Catholic version, whereas it omitted entirely several books which the "inquisitors" choose to consider apocryphal? And yet these men prate about "Romish regulations" and "inquisitorial censorship!"

---

[1] Vol. ii, 208.

[2] One of the principal cities of Brazil, and the capital of province of the same name.

[3] Vol. i, 302.

[4] Vol. i, 173.

[5] Vol. i, 137.

We do not know precisely what translation of the Old Testament Mr. Kidder sought to distribute among the Brazilians; whether it was a Catholic or a Protestant one; or whether, like the Spanish Bible just spoken of, it had a Catholic title-page and Protestant contents. Upon the translation of the New Testament he is more explicit; it purported to be a reprint of that rendered from the Latin vulgate by the Padre Antonio Pereira de Figueiredo, a standard orthodox version in Portugal. Mr. Kidder tells us that, "through some slanders circulated by an English Catholic priest residing at Rio, the suspicions of the old bishop were excited lest the translation was not actually what it purported to be, but had suffered alterations."[1] He adds, indeed, that "an examination was proposed," — by whom he is too cautious to state,— "but that either through inability, or willful neglect, it was not attempted." Very possibly the examination was challenged by the bishop of Rio, at the instance of the English Catholic priest, who was, no doubt, well acquainted with the pious frauds so frequently practised by these godly Bible societies, and thought it a duty to guard the unsuspecting Brasilians against them; or perhaps the bishop's mind was satisfied on the subject without a formal or public examination. We really would have been glad if our missionary had deemed it prudent to be a little more explicit on this matter.

One thing is, however, remarkable, that notwithstanding the well grounded suspicions just alluded to, Mr. Kidder met with very little opposition, either from the clergy or the people, in his attempt to circulate the Bible in Brazil. If we are to believe his own account, he was strongly encouraged in his enterprise by some of the first men in the country, including several Catholic priests. He was even emboldened to make a formal proposition on the subject, in the name of the New York Bible society, to the provincial government of San Paulo, and his proposals were received with great consideration; and, though never definitely acted upon, were yet advocated by some of the leading politicians of the province.[1] These facts may serve to show us that, after all, the Brazilian Catholics are not so much opposed to the circulation of the Scriptures in the vernacular, as some of our opponents would seem to imagine. Mr. Kidder himself bears ample testimony to the liberality and religious toleration of the Brazilians:

---

[1] Vol. I 336.

> "Yet the Brazilians, on their political disenthralment, adopted a liberal and tolerant constitution. Although it made the Roman Catholic apostolic religion that of the state, *yet it allowed all other forms of religion to be held and practised*, save in buildings 'having the exterior form of a temple.' It also forbade persecution on the ground of religious opinions."[2]

In another place he tells us:

> "It is my firm conviction that there is not a Roman Catholic country on the face of the globe, where there prevails a greater degree of toleration, or a greater liberality of feeling towards Protestants."[3]

After these avowals from an open enemy, it will scarcely do for our Protestant ministers to continue ringing in our ears the old cry of Catholics being priest-ridden in Catholic countries, or of "popish" intolerance and bigotry. They had better first remove the stain from their own character, and acquire themselves a more liberal and charitable spirit, before they indulge in tirades so unjust against their neighbors.

Mr. Kidder often speaks in terms of high eulogy of the Catholic clergy whom he met with in his travels; and he does not say much about their immorality, upon which we suppose he would have dilated at great length had he had the slightest grounds for so doing. Though he was known as an agent of a foreign Bible society, yet he was everywhere received with politeness, sometimes with marked kindness, by the Catholic clergy:

> "At one of those places, the individual to whom I was thus addressed, and by whom I was entertained, was a Roman Catholic priest;[4] and it affords me unfeigned satisfaction to say that the hospitality which I received under his roof was just what the stranger in a strange land would desire."[5]

The following tribute to Brazilian politeness and affability is enhanced by the well merited hit at the churlishness we often meet with in this "glorious Protestant land of open Bibles:"

"Within these coaches might be witnessed perfect specimens of

---

[1] Vol. i, 328, seqq.

[2] Vol. i, 137–8.

[3] Vol. i, 143.

[4] By a singular piece of legerdemain, he transforms this *priest* into a *deacon* two pages farther on.

[5] Vol. i, 313.

> Brazilian manners. A person accustomed to the distant and care-for-no-one airs which are generally observed in the New York stages, might be a little surprised that so much friendly attention and politeness could prevail among perfect strangers, who might happen to meet each other in these vehicles. It might be equally surprising to see that no one was excluded on account of color. Condition is the test of respectability in Brazil."[1]

There is a much stronger reason for this affability and politeness, so universal in Catholic countries, than many would be inclined to suspect; and the same reason explains the comparative coldness and selfishness of most Protestant people. The Catholic religion is eminently *social* in its very character; it draws people together; it merges the individual in the social feeling. Protestantism, on the contrary, is a system strongly anti-social in its tendency; it sets up every man for himself; it merges the social in the individual feeling; it leads to isolation, to selfishness.

Brazil is, we believe, the only country in South America where slavery exists; and our author admits that there, Catholicity often softens the hard lot of the slave, by infusing kindness and charity into the heart of the master or mistress. He furnishes us with the following picture of a very rich and pious Catholic widow, who lived near Rio:

> "On the other side of us lived a Portuguese widow, advanced in life, also surrounded with a house full of slaves. She was a model of amiability, if not of piety. She treated her slaves as tenderly as though they had been her own children, and was specially punctilious in calling them together at vespers, and causing them to say their pater nosters, and chant a litany of moderate length. So well trained were they to this exercise, that their voices would not have done discredit to the music of some of the churches."[2]

We would be indeed curious to learn whether any of our southern planters, who own a large number of slaves, ever exhibit so much care for their spiritual improvement, or whether any of them keeps a chaplain expressly for their benefit. This is often the case in Brazil, where people still entertain the strange old "popish" idea, that a master is bound to care somewhat for the *souls* as well as for the *bodies* of his servants. Here is the testimony of our missionary, on what he saw at an extensive manufactory at some distance from San Paulo, and we commend it to the attention of our own enlightened citizens, whether manufacturers or planters:

> "In the course of the evening, half an hour was devoted to vespers. I had observed a great number of the slaves entering, who, in succession, addressed us with crossed hands, and the pious salutation,—'*Seja louvado Nosso Senhor Jesus Christo*,—blessed be the (our?) Lord Jesus Christ.' Presently there commenced a chant in the adjoining room, when the padre who sat by my side, rising, said he supposed I did not pray, but that he was going to do so. I corrected this mistake, and he went out laughing, without, however, inviting any of us to accompany him. I was told that he attended these exercises merely as any other member of the family—the singing and prayers being taught and con-

---

[1] Vol. 1, 161.

[2] Vol. 1, 159-60. By *vespers* he probably meant evening prayers.

ducted by an aged black man. The devotions of the evening consisted chiefly of a *novena!* It was really pleasant to hear the sound of a hundred voices mingling in this their chief religious exercise and privilege. This assembling the slaves, generally at evening, and sometimes both morning and evening, is said *to be common on plantations in the country*, and is not unfrequent among domestics in the cities. *Mistress and servant at these times meet on a level.* The pleasures afforded the latter by such opportunities, in connection with the numerous holydays enjoined by the Roman Catholic religion, form certainly a great mitigation of the hard lot of servitude!"[1]

One would almost feel inclined to think that our zealous missionaries, who move heaven and earth to make proselytes to their new-fangled notions, instead of going out to distant Catholic lands, to unsettle the long-cherished religious belief of the people, would do much better to stay at home, and to labor for the reformation of their own brethren, by introducing amongst them the above, and many similar religious and social improvements, which, to their shame be it said, are almost peculiar to Catholic lands. Perhaps these domestic missions would not be attended with so much *eclat*, nor turn out so profitable to those concerned in them! Among the ameliorations we allude to, they might introduce with great advantage the *Irmandades*, or charitable Brotherhoods, so abundant in Catholic countries, and no where more common than in Brazil. Our author devotes an entire chapter[2] to these Brotherhoods, and to other charities of Rio; and our only regret is, that our narrow limits will not allow us to present copious extracts from his extended account of them Yet we must quote a few passages:

"The Brotherhoods contribute to the erection and support of churches, provide for the sick, bury the dead, and support Masses for souls. In short, next after the state, they are the most efficient auxiliaries for supporting the religious establishment of the country. Many of them, in the lapse of years, have become rich by the receipt of donations and legacies, and membership in such is highly prized."[3]

"The most extensive hospital in the city is that called the Santa Casa da Misericordia, or the Holy House of Mercy. This establishment is located on the sea shore, under the brow of the Castello hill, and is open day and night for the reception of the sick and distressed. The best assistance in the power of the administration to give, is here rendered to all, male or female, black or white, Moor or Christian,—none of whom, even the most wretched, are under the necessity of seeking influence or recommendations in order to be received. From the statistics of this establishment, it appears that more than five thousand patients are annually received, of whom more than one thousand die. . . . In this hospital are treated *vast numbers of English and American seamen*, the subjects of sickness or accident on their arrival, or during their stay in the port. Indeed, there are few nations of the world which are not represented among the inmates of the Misericordia of Rio de Janeiro. . . . The benevolence of this house is not confined to those within its infirmaries, but extends to the different prisons of the city, most of whose inmates receive food and medicine from the provisions of the Misericordia."[4]

This is truly a Catholic charity, well worthy of our admiration and imitation. Mr. Kidder does not tell us, that there was organized at Rio a "native" party, the chief staple of whose tactics was the abuse of those "vast numbers" of foreigners, "English and American," who were received and sheltered in their sickness by the charity of the city. Very probably the good people of Rio have not yet become sufficiently enlightened, either to denounce "foreign paupers," or to burn down the churches of those who happen to differ with them in faith! They may yet learn something of this species of charity from their northern neighbors, especially if the itinerant missionaries, who are now visiting them, should happily succeed in rooting out the old faith, and substituting therefor their thousand and one new creeds, all right, yet all differing among themselves! When the Bible will have been fully introduced into Rio, we may perhaps hear of its being paraded through the streets as a party ensign, and of a commentary on its principles being written in fire and blood, as happened in Philadelphia under the happy auspices of the preachers!

---

[1] Vol. i, 246—7. [2] Chap. v, vol. i, p. 79, seqq. [3] Vol. i, 159-60 [4] Vol. ii, 46-7.

But really we anticipate no such glorious results, unless, indeed, subsequent missionaries should succeed much better than did the Rev. Mr. Kidder and his associate, the Rev. Justin Spaulding. Mr. Kidder does not tell us of a single convert made either by himself or his worthy colleague; at least, if he does, it has entirely escaped our notice. The Rev. Justin Spaulding, his senior in the mission, was chiefly employed in teaching a common day school at Rio during the week; and he performed Protestant service on Sundays in a room, "where a respectable congregation, *chiefly composed of American and English residents*, regularly worshiped and listened to the preaching of the Gospel."[1] Mr. Kidder himself could not preach in Portuguese,[2] and, therefore, confined himself to the distribution of Bibles, Testaments, and tracts. He, in fact, with admirable simplicity, lets out the secret that his whole mission turned out pretty much of a failure: of course he does not say so in so many words, but he says so in substance. He tells us:

> "Indeed, the whole system of means by which, in Protestant countries, access is had to the public mind, is unpractised and unknown (in Brazil.) The stranger, therefore, and especially the supposed heretic, who would labor for the promotion of true religion (!), must expect to avail himself of providential openings, rather than to rely on previously concerted plans. The missionary, in such circumstances, learns a lesson of great practical importance to himself: to-wit, that he should be grateful for any occasion, *however small*, of *attempting* to do good in the name of his Master. The romantic notions which some entertain of a mission field, may become chastened and humbled by contact WITH THE COLD REALITY OF FACTS; but the Christian heart will not be rendered harder, nor genuine faith less susceptible of an entire reliance on God."[3]

His resignation is almost as edifying, as his want of success is prominent and clearly marked. What surprises us most, is, that Protestants in this country will still consent to be deluded with the hope of *perverting*

---

[1] Vol. i, 136. [2] Vol i, 190. [3] Vol. i, 212-13.

Catholic countries to their own novel and *cameleon* doctrines, in the face of such avowals as this, and after the notorious failure of all previous schemes for the same purpose. What astonishes us, is not the fact that Brother Jonathan has been gulled in the matter, — for every one knows that he is his own father's son in this amiable foible,—but that he has consented to draw so heavily on his pockets to support a bubble that has already burst so often, and must always burst in future, so sure as similar causes always produce similar effects under the same circumstances. Protestantism is doomed to barrenness. What nation or people has it ever converted from paganism to Christianity? What good has come of all the millions of money it has expended, and of the millions of Bibles and tracts it has circulated? Has the Bible, circulated among the people, ever converted a tribe or nation? If so, where is it to be found?

The Bible itself says, that "faith comes by *hearing*;"[1] and yet these Reverend missionaries, out of pure love for the Bible, seek to nullify this divine principle, and to prove that faith comes by *reading!* Can we, then, wonder at their repeated and total failures in converting the world? Besides, in attempting to circulate the Bible among Catholics in Catholic countries, they proceed on the glaring falsehood and calumny — already refuted a thousand times — that but for *their* efforts the Bible would be there a wholly unknown and sealed book! The Bible was known, and read, and loved by Catholics for long centuries before all these new and quarreling and self-glorifying and almost infinitely multiplied religious notions became current in the world. And still these new men, but of yesterday, would fain persuade the world that it is indebted to *them* for the Bible! Our Saviour commanded His apostles to *preach*, but never uttered a syllable about *writing*; and how can these new and self-sent apostles, who pursue a totally different course, hope for success?

We have seen that Mr. Kidder did not know Portuguese enough to be able to preach in that language. One would think that he ought to have learned the language before going to Brazil. He could not hope to do the service for which he was well paid without this necessary qualification. Like most other missionaries, he took his wife and family with him to share in the apostolic labors and rich emoluments of the mission,—for missionary wives receive salaries as well as their husbands, why not? they do at least as much good:—but just as he was about preparing himself to preach in Portuguese, his heart was rent with anguish by her sudden death, and he was compelled to return precipitately to America, "as a hopeful means of preserving the life of an infant son."[2] We heartily sympathize with him in his bereavement; but every one must see, from this tragic circumstance, that "if he had been unmarried he would have been without solicitude," and would not have been compelled to leave his mission so suddenly. When will these ministers learn to prize the example and follow the advice of St. Paul? "Art thou loosed from a wife? SEEK NOT A WIFE."[3]

---

[1] Romans x.

[2] Vol. ii, 351-3.

[3] Corinth. vii, 27.

We had intended to make some more remarks: as for example to mention that *Fejio,* the pretended Brazilian bishop, who wrote the work against the celibacy of the clergy, pretty well known in this country, was never actually a bishop, but a very bad priest, who left the holy ministry, married, devoted himself wholly to politics, and wrote this work probably to defend his apostasy and sacrilegious violation of solemn vows. He was the Talleyrand of Brazil. We wished also to say that Mr. Kidder found schools every where throughout the Brazilian empire,—a pretty severe rebuke to those who are for ever inveighing against "popish" ignorance and superstition. But our paper is filled, and we must conclude, referring those who wish for additional information to the work itself.

XXXI. THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES.*

DR. DURBIN'S OBSERVATIONS IN THE EAST.

The present struggle in the East—The ancient episcopal Sees—Alexandria—Antioch—Jerusalem—Constantinople—Statistics of the eastern and western churches in the early ages—Ancient glory and present degradation of the Oriental Churches—A picture of desolation—A vast necropolis—Decrease of population—Testimonies of Dr. Frankland and Dr. Durbin—Number of Christians in the Turkish empire—Chastisement inflicted on the Greek schismatics—Their present forlorn condition—The only hope for their restoration—Their discipline in regard to the celibacy of the clergy—Their acknowledged agreement in doctrine with the Roman Catholics—Argument founded thereon in favor of the Catholic Church—Protestant missionaries in the East—Have they succeeded?—Dr. Durbin's admissions—His omissions supplied in regard to the Protestant missions of Hasbeja and Oroomiah—Disunion among the Protestant missionaries—Catholic missions in the East—Dr. Durbin's candid avowal—Statistics—The seven Apocalyptic churches—The church of Philadelphia—Downright popery – Christian charity recommended.

THE struggle for political ascendency, at present going on in the East between the Allied Powers and the Russian Czar, has directed the attention of the civilized world to that quarter, and has invested with special interest whatever is connected with the past history and present condition of the Oriental Christians. It is for this reason that we deem it opportune to republish our remarks on Dr. Durbin's Observations in the East, written some years ago, with such modifications as present circumstances may seem to demand.

Every student in ecclesiastical history is familiar with the early prosperity and splendor of the Oriental Churches. Built up, many of them, by the apostles themselves, or their immediate disciples, and often watered by their blood, they continued to increase and to flourish for centuries, and diffused throughout the entire east, together with the light of the Gospel, the inestimable benefit of Christian civilization. Episcopal sees were erected in all the principal cities; and, wherever they were established, there grew up around them those admirable institutions of learning and charity which have always followed in the train of Christianity, and which have contributed so powerfully to change the face of society. The great patriarchal sees of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and subsequently that of Constantinople, became the radiating points of a new literature and a new civilization, much more useful and permanent, if not more brilliant, than had been those of the ancient classical times.

During the first four centuries, Alexandria, the capital of Egypt, was the great commercial emporium of the east, as well as the principal seat of Christian philosophy and literature. Founded by St. Mark, the favored disciple of St. Peter, the patriarchal see of this city was the first in order and dignity after that of Rome — the see of St. Peter himself. Its Christian school, founded early in the third century, had produced a Clement, a Dionysius, and an Origen; and the see numbered among its illustrious occupants the glorious names of a St. Alexander, a St. Athanasius, and a St. Cyril.

---

* *Observations in the East; chiefly in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor.* By John P. Durbin, D. D., late president of Dickinson college; author of "Observations in Europe," &c. In two volumes, 12mo. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1845.

Next in point of rank came Antioch, the ancient capital of Syria, the second city of the east, and the see of Peter during the first seven years of his primacy, before he removed it to Rome under the Emperor Claudius. Its Christians schools were likewise famous throughout Asia, and they exercised a powerful influence over theological studies.[1] The great St. John Chrysostom had been there trained to virtue and learning, and for many years of his early career, his voice had in this church eloquently proclaimed the magnificent beauties and impressive truths of Christianity; while the sainted Flavians and other great and good men had successively discharged therein the office of patriarch. The third of the oriental sees was that of Jerusalem, founded originally by St. James, and subsequently illustrated by the virtues and learning of the St. Cyrils and the Juvenals.

It was only in the fourth century that Constantinople, till then called Byzantium, attained to the dignity of even an episcopal see; and until near the close of that century, it was content to occupy the *fourth* place among the episcopal cities of the east, and the fifth counting Rome. It was only by a bold innovation on this ancient order of things, first attempted by the Greek bishops of the second general council held at Constantinople in 381, and pushed still farther by those of the fourth general council held at Chalcedon in 451, that this see was placed *second* after that of Rome.[2] The Roman Pontiffs and the western church, however, never approved of this innovation, which they viewed as both unjust to the other patriarchal sees, and fraught with danger to the peace of the Church. The event has, alas! but too sadly proved the wisdom of their forecast, and the justice of their forebodings! These ambitious steps of the Constantinopolitan bishops finally led to the deplorable Greek schism, with all its endless train of evils. But before it took place the see of Constantinople was rendered illustrious by such men as St. Gregory Nazianzen and St. John Chrysostom, to say nothing of many other great names.

The other distinguished episcopal sees of the east, in the early ages of Christianity, were those of Ephesus, Smyrna, Cæsarea, and Edessa; to say nothing of the other churches mentioned by St. John in the first chapters of the Apocalypse, and of those spoken of by St. Paul in his

---

[1] This influence became, subsequently, of a dangerous character, from the growing rationalistic spirit which pervaded investigations allowed in the school. This remark is, to a certain extent, also true of the school of Alexandria. The school of Edessa, under the guidance of St. Ephraim, was much more unexceptionable. See Newman's "Essay on the Development," &c.

[2] It must be observed, that this regulation had reference only to ecclesiastical rank, and that the famous 28th canon of the latter council was not subscribed by one-half of the bishops, nor by the legates of the Pope.

Epistles, and by St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles. The great St. Basil, St. Ephraim, St. Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius, the father of Church History, and a host of other illustrious writers, shed a flood of light and splendor on the early history of the Oriental Churches. *Their* fame is confined to no country and to no age; it belongs to all generations and to all Christendom.

We have no means of ascertaining with precision the Christian population of the eastern church in the fourth and following centuries; or what proportion it bore to that of the west. That it was immense, may be gathered from the fact, that the east then teemed with an abundant and overflowing population, the vast majority of which was Christian. By the beginning of the fifth century, paganism had so far declined, as to be almost reckoned among the things that were. Another fact may serve to give us some idea of the great extension of Christianity at that early period, and may also enable us to estimate the relative Christian population of the east and of the west. Learned Christian antiquaries inform us that, towards the close of the fourth century, there were about *eighteen hundred bishops* in all Christendom, of whom nearly a thousand belonged to the eastern church. The episcopal sees were then, however, much more limited in extension than they are at the present day, and therefore much more numerous in proportion to the population. This was more particularly the case in the east, and also in northern Africa. Thus we find, that of the eight hundred bishoprics in the west, about four hundred were in northern Africa alone. Yet no one would surely pretend to infer from this circumstance, that the Christian population in that small portion of Africa, was one half of that in the entire west.

Upon the whole we may, perhaps, conclude that, during the first five centuries, the number of Christians in the east and in the west was about equal. After the final conversion of the northern nations, effected successively in the fifth and following centuries down to the tenth, the western Church acquired an immense preponderance in numbers; and, since the final consummation of the Greek schism, in the eleventh century, this preponderance has gone on steadily increasing, until, at present, the western Church has nearly *four times* as many members as the eastern, including the Russian church and all the oriental sectaries. Ever since the schism, the Greek church has been steadily declining, and the Latin Church has been as steadily progressing.

But the glory of the Greek church during the early ages, belongs to the great body of Christians; for, during all that period, the eastern and the western churches were united into the one Catholic Church, — "the one sheepfold under the one Shepherd." Viewing the subject in this light, every Catholic heart must exult at the former splendor, and weep over the present fallen and forlorn condition, of the Oriental Churches. Could the great and illustrious bishops and saints, who once shed so brilliant a lustre upon that portion of Christendom, now arise from their tombs, how sad a prospect would break upon their vision! Would they recognize, in the present desolate and degraded condition of the Oriental Christians, any traces of that prosperity which they had formerly witnessed, and to which they had, under Providence, so greatly contributed? Alas! how the face of things has changed. The glory of those time-honored and illustrious sees has faded for ever. For nearly four hundred years, has that once chosen portion of God's inheritance been groaning under an oppressive and a crushing Turkish slavery; many of her once flourishing cities blotted out from the face of the earth, others lying desolate and in ruins, and even those which remain, shorn of half their original splendor. Alas! for the uncertainty of human events! Alas! for those sins which brought down so terrible a chastisement of heaven!

It is, indeed, a sad thought, but one full of instruction for us, that what was once the blooming garden of Christian civilization has now become a dreary waste, a frightful wilderness; all its flowers blighted, all its fruits plucked. Asia Minor, once the Eden of the world, and the most refreshing spot in Christendom, is now strewn only with ruins and with tombs, and it has become a vast necropolis, or resting place for the ashes of the dead! Dr. Durbin draws the following graphic picture of this striking contrast:

> "Our road lay directly over Mount Pagus, from the heights of which we descended by an ancient paved way, much broken up, into one of those incomparable valleys of Asia Minor, which to the eye seem to be completely shut in by high, broken gray mountains, and yet are connected with the adjacent valleys by narrow extensions between the mountains. . . . . . Their wonderful fertility, when well cultivated, may be inferred from the fact that, in ancient times, the smallest of them sustained a city with its dependent towns, and each of the largest was adorned with several cities, some of which were remarkable for population and wealth. The names of most of these are preserved in history, but the sites of many are utterly unknown. Indeed, Asia Minor may be considered one vast solitude, rendered exceedingly impressive by the number of cemeteries which the traveler sees every few hours. No villages or towns are in sight of them. No groves of cypress or terebinth shade them. The former glory and power of the countless millions that sleep in them are indicated by the fragments of marbles, columns, pedestals, richly carved capitals, freizes, and sarcophagi, which lie half covered by the tangled thickets of shrubs, vines, and wild flowers, on which the flocks of the wandering Turkman occasionally browse. Indeed, all Asia Minor appears like one vast necropolis of the unknown and forgotten dead. The cemeteries of towns at present inhabited are usually adorned with groves of evergreens; the cypress is appropriated to the Moslems, the terebinth, or common fir, to the Armenians and Greeks, but the graves of the Jews, either by choice or from coercion, are unadorned even by an erect stone. Their grave-yards throughout the east are naked, stony fields, a striking picture of desolation and distress."[1]

This frightful desolation extends to the very heart of Asia Minor; to the banks of the Hemus, and to the once smiling borders of the Gygean lake. Hear again our Reverend tourist:

"They (the guides) were lost for four hours, during which we literally wandered *among the tombs*, both ancient and comparatively modern; the former being the *tumuli* of the old Lydians, the latter, cemeteries of the Mohammedan population, which has long since disappeared from the Sardian plains. Nowhere did I feel so forcibly the desolation of Asia Minor as when I sat amid the foundations of Sardis, crossed those plains, now without an inhabitant, on which Cyrus, Xerxes, Darius, Alexander, Antiochus, and the Roman had marshaled their millions of warriors, and decided the fate of empires, and wandered amid those vast cemeteries which, for two thousand five hundred years, received the successive generations of cities and towns, of which now not a vestige remains."[1]

---

[1] Vol. ii, p. 118 and seqq.

This desolation pervades the entire extent of the Turkish empire, both in Asia and in Europe. Everywhere the population is melting away under the influence of a ruthless and senseless depotism. The empire itself is fast tottering to its fall; and in this circumstance alone is found the principal hope of the speedy emancipation and more brilliant future of the Oriental Christians. Says Dr. Durbin:

"But the decrease of the population is the most marked symptom of decay. At first the decrease occurred chiefly among the native Christians, who melted away under the intolerable oppression of the Moslems; but for the last two centuries it has taken place among the Moslems themselves. The traveler is struck with astonishment and filled with melancholy, as he beholds the crowded and countless cemeteries amid vast solitudes, where, but a few generations past, flourished populous cities, towns and villages; the turbans on the tombstones testify that a Mohammedan and not a Christian population is buried there. So I found it everywhere in Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor, and so Mr. Walsh describes it for a distance of three hundred miles from the capital, through Roumelia to the Danube, naturally one of the most fertile portions of the earth."[2]

Captain Frankland, another tourist, to whose testimony he appeals, furnishes the following sad account of that once flourishing portion of the Turkish empire:

"From the banks of the Danube to the shores of the Propontis, the traveler will see fertile provinces lying waste, well inhabited cities of the dead (cemeteries,) but desolate and ruined abodes of the living. He will see the remains of the arts, and the civilization of a former and a better age, and but few marks of the present era, save such as denote barbarism and decay. The few towns that he will meet with in his long and dreary journey are rapidly falling into ruin, and the only road now existing, and which can put in any claim to such an appellation, is either of the Roman age, or that of the great Sultan Solyman; but even this pavement is almost worse than nothing. Wherever the Osmanli has trod, devastation and ruin mark his steps, civilization and the arts have fled, and made room for barbarism, and the silence of the desert and the tomb. 'Where the sultan's horse has trod, there grows no grass,' is a Turkish proverb, and a fatal truth."[3]

Dr. Durbin thus sums up his remarks on this subject:

"The extent of this decay of population cannot be accurately ascertained, as no census is ever taken. The various countries comprising the empire possess natural capabilities sufficient to support the declarations of history that they teemed with population at the time of their first subjection to the Mohammedan power. Comparing their condition now with what it was then, we shall not exaggerate the decrease of population when we say that THREE-FOURTHS of it have disappeared, and the progress of decay is increasing rather than diminishing. It is impossible to approximate with certainty the present population of Turkey. Reid says that in the seventeenth century it was about forty-one millions; 'but at the present day, it is a matter of doubt if the Turkish sceptre *de facto* sways over eight millions of people.' C. B. Elliott estimates the present population at about twenty millions, and the natural capacity of the country sufficient to sustain four times twenty millions. Amid these conflicting estimates, one point stands forth undisputed,—the rapid and increasing decay of the Mohammedan empire."[1]

---

[1] Vol. ii, p. 152.

[2] Ibid. pp. 259-60.

[3] Ibid. p. 261.

In spite of the long continued and grinding oppressions of the Turks, the Christians, even at this day, constitute considerably more than one-fourth of the entire population of the empire. This is, indeed, a consoling fact, and one that speaks favorably of the perseverance of the Christians there, in the midst of trials which have seldom fallen to the lot of any other body of men. It shows at least the utter powerlessness of persecution; if it does not even lead us to hope, that Providence has yet in store some great blessing for the Oriental Churches, and some high mission for them to accomplish. Says our Traveler:

"It is strange, that the western churches should be aroused by the more recent results of the researches of enterprising and intelligent travelers, who have established the fact, that more than one-fourth of the people of the Turkish empire are professed and steadfast Christians. Hassel sets down the Mohammedan population of all Asia at seventy millions, and the Christian at seventeen millions. But if we confine the comparison to the Turkish empire, it will be much more favorable to the Christians. Mr. Southgate estimates the Christian population of Turkey and Abyssinia at fifteen millions, more than one-fourth of the whole; and if the comparison were confined to Turkey in Europe and Asia, the Christian population would amount to perhaps one-third: it would certainly, if the Bedouins be excluded, and the comparison limited to those who dwell in permanent habitations. Turkey in Europe has a population of about seven millions, of which four millions are Christians. The Westminster Review, for January, 1841, estimates the Christian population of Syria at one-third of the whole."[2]

The interest of this fact is greatly enhanced by the circumstance, that the Christian population is distributed throughout the whole empire, chiefly in the largest cities, and at the most favorable and commanding points, where their influence is most likely to be felt; and also by the additional fact, that they are, in general, the most intelligent portion of the population. The Armenians, in particular, are the great merchants and bankers of the east. Add to this, that each Christian nation has a separate organization of its own, and is ruled by its own patriarch, and that all those in communion with the Roman Catholic Church — a large body as we shall soon see — are moreover under the special protection of France or of some other European Catholic power; and we may then be prepared to estimate the importance of the Christian population in the

---

[1] Vol. ii, pp. 261-2.

[2] Ibid, p. 276.

Turkish empire, and the weight it must necessarily have hereafter in deciding the political destinies of the east.

While the Moslem power is daily declining, that of the Christians is constantly on the increase; and the day, we hope, is not far distant, when this once haughty power shall be laid in the dust, and Christianity shall resume its ancient empire in western Asia. Fondly do we trust that God may hasten the coming of this happy day, the earlier dawn of which hath already appeared in the east. Fervently do we hope and pray that the cruel captivity of the Oriental Churches may at length cease; that they may again sit down with us in peace in the house of our Lord, in the unity of faith and of love; and that the Church may again have the consolation of witnessing — what she beheld during the first eight centuries — the union of the east and west in the same faith, in the same worship, and under the same spiritual government.

How is this result to be secured? And is there any reasonable hope that it will ever be realized? More unlikely revolutions have often occurred in history; and we know, that since the final consummation of the Greek schism, a re-union of the churches was temporarily effected at two different periods; once in the thirteenth, and once again in the fifteenth century. Why should it not take place again, and under more favorable auspices? Has not the Greek church been scourged long enough for its pride and disobedience? Should it not at length feel "humbled under the mighty hand of God?" After having been so long chastised, should it not finally learn wisdom, and return to the bosom of unity?

There is no doubt, that the forlorn condition of the Greek church, for many centuries past, is an effect of a divine retributive justice. The Greeks had ever been proud, disputatious, caviling, and insubordinate. Nearly all the heresies which troubled the repose of the primitive Church, originated amongst them, and were condemned by councils convened within their borders. And the worst feature in their religious errors was this, that, though generally of a speculative character, they were aimed at the very foundations of Christianity — at the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Incarnation. But the great reason of the signal chastisement inflicted on them, is found in the towering pride and ambition of the patriarchs of Constantinople. They could not brook the primacy of the Roman see, which, nevertheless, the Greek church had acknowledged for centuries; and God gave them up to a reprobate sense, and made them the slaves of the Grand Turk. They escaped from an imagiuary, and fell into a real bondage. Their example is a striking commentary on the divine declarations: "pride goeth before a fall," and "every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled."

Two facts at least are undeniable; — all history proclaims their truth: the Greek church prospered so long as it was in communion with Rome; it has constantly declined since the date of its separation from Rome. God blessed it, while it was connected with that rock upon which Christ built His Church; his malediction has lain heavily upon it, ever since it has been riven by schism from that rock. It is now like a branch torn from the living vine; deprived of the vital sap, it has withered and died. Christ never promised His grace or blessing to any but those who were humble, who heard the Church, and who walked in unity and charity. The signal punishment of the Greek church is an impressive commentary on this great truth.

Every one must be forcibly struck by the fact, that, while all the once flourishing and famous episcopal sees of the east are either entirely blotted out of existence, or are dragging out a miserable life in bondage and darkness; while Antioch and Ephesus have disappeared, and Alexandria, Smyrna, and Constantinople are covered with the pall of death; Rome, though time and revolution have dealt more severely with her than with any other city in the world, still remains, the same flourishing, vigorous, and "eternal" city,—the only one of the apostolical churches which has preserved its succession unbroken, and which can carry us back to the days when the apostles received their commission from the lips of the blessed Jesus. How explain this singular phenomenon, but by the principles indicated above? Is not the permanency of Rome, under all the circumstances, a most palpable fulfillment of Christ's prediction addressed to St. Peter: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, AND THE GATES OF HELL SHALL NOT PREVAIL AGAINST IT?" It is impossible to explain it in any other way, unless we virtually deny an all-ruling Providence, and ascribe all the great results of history to a mere blind chance or fatality.

That the Greek church is reduced to a state of great ignorance and degradation, there is no doubt. Dr. Durbin bears evidence to the fact in many passages of his interesting "Observations." We must content ourselves with the following:

> "The power of the priesthood over the people in the Oriental Churches is incredible, and it is often exercised in the most rigorous manner, particularly among the Greeks, whose clergy exact oppressive fees for the performance of every religious service—for marriages, funerals, and the sacraments—all of which are matters of barter, and are paid for according to the wealth of the party served. No preparation is required for entrance into the holy office of the ministry; and there are no schools for the prophets, in which they may obtain some knowledge of divine things, before they enter upon the service of the altar. This deplorable state of the oriental communions is not a matter of surprise, when we remember their long night of darkness, and the oppression under which they have been subjected."[1]

Their separation from Rome, we sincerely believe, has had at least as much to do with their present corruptions, as the long night of darkness and servitude in which they have been involved. Another cause of it is the marriage of the clergy, more or less in use among them. A married clergy cannot be expected to be so much separated from the world, so much addicted to study, or so devoted to the interests of religion, as one that is single; and no one can travel in the east without being forcibly impressed with the difference, in all these respects, between that portion of the Greek clergy which leads a single life, and that which is involved in the troubles and solicitude attendant on providing for a family. Dr. Durbin is, however, not correct in stating, without any qualification, that the "Greeks reject the celibacy of the clergy:" for it is a notorious fact that they continue to prize celibacy as a state more perfect than that of matrimony, whenever it is embraced through those religious motives indicated by St. Paul.[1] This is apparent from the fact, that they universally require their monks and bishops to be celibitaries, that no priest is allowed to marry after ordination, and that no one is admitted to orders who has been married more than once, or who, in the language of St. Paul, to whom this discipline is ascribed, has been the husband of more than "one wife." Dr. Durbin should have stated these well known features in the oriental discipline, in regard to celibacy.

---

[1] Vol. ii, pp. 284-5.

He, however, bears willing testimony to another most remarkable fact, that *all* the Greek churches, no matter how much separated from each other by sectional feelings and sectarian prejudices, unanimously agree with one another, *and with the Roman Catholic Church*, in almost all those distinctive points of doctrine and discipline, in which Protestants differ from us. Here is his evidence:

> "To the Protestant Christian there appears a wide spread blight upon this fair field of missionary hope and enterprise, in the almost universal corruption of all the oriental communions. It is not to be denied, that in all essential points of doctrine and order, the Greek, the Armenian, the Syrian, and the Nestorian churches agree substantially with the Roman Catholics of Europe. Some of the points of difference regard matters of discipline, as the supremacy of the Pope,[2] and the celibacy of the clergy, both of which the Oriental Churches[3] steadfastly reject; others are speculative, as, for instance, the doctrine of the Greek church with respect to the procession of the Holy Ghost from the *Father* only, and not from the Father *and the Son;* and that of the Syrians and Nestorians, who are Monophysites, (!) holding that there is but one nature in Christ. But in all essential elements of church government and doctrine, they agree with the Roman Catholics of Europe. They believe in the three separate orders of the ministry, regularly derived, by unbroken succession, from the apostles; and each principal church has its patriarch, which (who?) bears nearly the same relation to it, that the Pope does to the Latin Church. They believe in the seven sacraments, and in the same sense that the Romanists (!) do!"[4]

In proof of all this, he furnishes us with a literal translation from a portion of the catechism now used by the Armenian churches;[5] which translation was made out by one of the American Protestant missionaries. While we praise his candor in thus stating a fact which is notorious to all persons of any information, but which has nevertheless been denied by the ignorant and superficial, we cannot but smile at his singular carelessness or ignorance in setting down the Nestorians as "Monophysites holding that there is but one nature in Christ." He probably meant the Eutychians, or Jacobites; for the Nestorians not only hold the precise contrary of this doctrine, but they even go farther, and maintain that there are *two distinct persons* in Christ, the one human, and the other divine. Every child who has glanced at church history is acquainted with this fact; and we are astonished that it escaped a Methodist doctor of divinity of some standing in his sect.

---

[1] Corinthians, ch. vii.

[2] This is a *doctrine*, and not a mere matter of discipline.

[3] He means, of course, those Oriental Churches which are not in communion with Rome, and, in a note, he excepts the Maronites. He might have excepted large bodies of Christians in almost all the other branches of the Oriental Church.

[4] Vol ii, pp. 281-2.

[5] Ibid.

The Oriental Churches agree with us, not only in doctrine, but also in many of those religious observances which are most obnoxious to Protestants. Dr. Durbin also attests this, though in his testimony he indulges in the usual ignorant, self-sufficient, and slanderous cant, which Protestant preachers consider it their special privilege to employ, whenever they speak of what they are pleased to designate by the vulgar nicknames of Popery and *Romanism*. He says:

> "Nor is the worship of the Oriental Churches freer from corruptions than that of the Roman Catholic. They worship pictures and the cross, as do the Latins, and pay a more constant and ardent devotion than the Catholics to the *Panagia* or 'Holy Virgin, mother of God.' Their reverence for saints is as profound, and their invocation of them as frequent, as among the Roman Catholics. Their public services consist almost entirely in daily matins, mass, and vespers; and when the host (or bread and wine after consecration) is carried among the people, they fall down and worship it with a grosser superstition than even the Latins."[1]

His feelings were often shocked by exhibitions of public worship, marked by all these objectionable traits; and from the tenor of his remarks interspersed throughout his work, we are inclined to infer that he considers the oriental communions more objectionable and "corrupt" than the Roman Catholic itself, and that he would even prefer the latter to the former. Nor is he the only Protestant traveler who has come to this conclusion. If the Roman Catholic Church be corrupt and erroneous in these things, then is the Greek church also, and to a much greater extent; and the conclusion is irresistible, that Christ permitted His whole Church, both east and west, to go to ruin and to apostatize from Him for many centuries, though He had pledged His solemn word "that the gates of hell should not prevail against it;" and though he had positively commanded all "to hear it," under the awful penalty of being reckoned "with heathens and publicans." If we could believe this, we would lose all faith in Christianity and in its divine Author. And accordingly we are not all surprised that enlightened Protestants are either returning to the bosom of Catholicity, or are rushing headlong into the frightful abyss of infidelity. There is no *rational* medium between the two.

How are we to explain the astonishing consent of the Greek communions and the Roman Catholic Church in maintaining all those distinctive doctrines and principles which Protestants unanimously reject? We can explain the phenomenon in only one of two ways: either by saying that the Greeks received these doctrines from the Latins, or the Latins from the Greeks; or that they both received them from a common source, dating back to a period prior to their separation. The former hypothesis is untenable and even absurd; for how is it to be believed that either of these churches so averse to each other would have consented quietly to abandon its ancient faith and discipline at the bidding, or through the influence, of a hated rival? Besides history is not only wholly silent as to this change, but it teaches precisely the contrary: that neither church borrowed any thing from the other after the schism. We are, then, compelled to fall back on the latter mode of explanation. But whither does it lead us? It leads us to the admission of the startling *fact*, that the whole Church of Christ, both Greek and Latin, unanimously held all these doctrines as early as the eighth century! And that, if the Roman Catholic Church be now wrong in maintaining them, the whole Church of Christ has been involved in fatal error, ever since that period!

---

[1] Vol. ii, pp. 283-4.

But the chain of inference does not terminate with the eighth century; for the Nestorians and the Eutychians left the Church in the fifth century, and yet they unanimously hold the self-same principles! Then the corruption of the original doctrine, if it occurred at all, must have taken place before the beginning of the fifth century. The question returns: *When* did it take place? *Where? Under what circumstances? By whom? Who* were the opponents of the bold innovator? In *what council* of bishops was he condemned? Tell us all about it; for we wish to be informed. History tells us of the origin of every error and heresy, — of its author, of its circumstances, of its condemnation. Why should it not give us also the desired information on this other all important subject?

But the change took place silently and imperceptibly, and without any one being aware of it. If so, what evidence have you, that it took place at all? If no one perceived or knew it at the time it happened, how comes it that *you* perceive and know it centuries afterwards? This is the old excuse of the Jews: while the soldiers were asleep the disciples came and stole the body of the Lord! If the witnesses were asleep, how did they know the fact to which they testified? But you reason even more foolishly than did the Jews: they brought at least *sleeping* witnesses; you bring no witnesses at all! The conclusion reached above, then, returns in all its force: either the Catholic Church is true, or Christianity is not: there is no alternative.

Dr. Durbin relies chiefly on the labors of the Protestant missionaries in the east, for the purification and complete regeneration of the Oriental Churches. He devotes a comparatively large portion of his "Observations" to this subject. And yet, to read his own account, partial and exaggerated as it undoubtedly is, one would be inclined to suspect that, if this be the only hope of the oriental communions, the period of their deliverance is indeed very remote. He does not tell us of *a single church* which the Protestant missionaries have erected for the benefit of their converts; nor, in fact, of anything that they have really done for the conversion of these benighted Christians of the east. Those missionaries, in fact, seem to be very prudent men, who take care to keep themselves out of harm's way, and who do not at all ambition the crown of martyrdom. Who ever heard of a Protestant missionary among the heathen that ever suffered martyrdom, if he could possibly help it? We have never yet read of one such. The Protestant missionaries in the east seem to confine themselves almost entirely to places of safety, such as the large towns, and the precincts of the European consulates: they issue forth only when everything is calm, and nothing is to be apprehended. Their labors at Smyrna, at Beirout, at Constantinople, seem to be confined almost entirely to European or American merchants and sailors. We have yet to learn of *one* congregation which they have organised among those for whose conversion they were specially sent out by the board, with a handsome outfit and a fat salary too, amply sufficient for their comfortable support and for that of their wives and families.

At Smyrna, Dr. Durbin says, they have "A chapel connected with the Dutch consulate, in which they perform divine service regularly;" and "the Protestant population numbers *perhaps* six hundred."[1] "This little leaven," he adds, "is operating *almost unobserved*, yet powerfully, on the ancient Greek and Armenian communities, *gradually* attracting their attention to a purer and more spiritual Christianity."

The usual cant: "gradually and unobserved," yet "powerfully!" Always doing, and yet never doing anything! The prospect always bright; the fields always white for the coming harvest; yet the realization of hope never coming, and the harvest never gathered in! Money, money, money! Give us more money, and we will convert the heathen, and the benighted Catholic and Greek; this is the battle-cry of the missionaries. The money is freely given; but the promise is never redeemed. The missionaries distribute a cargo of tracts and Testaments, and then they write home that they "hope" soon to convert the world, and that the only thing which is wanting is a little more money, and a few more zealous missionaries, male and female! Was there ever such an imposture as this—one that was so long kept up, though withal so very expensive?

Dr. Durbin virtually and substantially confirms the truth of these remarks. No one can read his work without being forcibly struck with the paucity of result attending Protestant missionary enterprise in the east. The missionaries always work "silently and unostentatiously;" nobody sees any thing they do; yet they do wonders, and they are on the eve of converting the east to Protestantism:

> "It is this silent, unostentatious way of conducting the mission, that leads travelers to suppose, that no valuable results are obtained. They see *no churches, no congregations, as the fruit of many years' toil, and a large expenditure of money.* Could they look into the interior mind and

---

[1] Vol. ii, p. 111.

feelings of the Oriental Churches, and note the symptoms of a new life and an approaching resuscitation, they would see that the seed sown is germinating, and it requires no great sagacity to predict a glorious harvest."[1]

And yet there are constantly employed in the Protestant missions of Turkey and Persia no less than ninety-two[2] missionaries, male and female, with excellent salaries!

The only two stations where the missionaries seemed to have any real prospect of success were Hasbeja on Mount Lebanon, and Oroomiah among the Nestorians of Persia. In both these places they have signally failed, and from both they have been ignominiously driven out. Dr. Durbin tells us a sad story in reference to the former place,[3] and the public newspapers have given us information in regard to the latter.

But neither Dr. Durbin nor the religious (!) prints of the day, tell us *half the truth* on either subject. They should have had the candor to say that, on the Lebanon, the American Protestant missionaries were in silent league with the infidel Druses and the fanatical Turks, who butchered in cold blood the Christian Maronites; that they were never molested by the former, while Catholic priests and monks and nuns were cruelly massacred; and that their property was as safe there as were their persons. They should also have told us, that among the Nestorians these same American Protestant missionaries became hateful for their intolerance and grasping ambition, which aimed at little less than a union of church and state; that they instigated the expulsion of the Catholic missionaries; and that they were themselves expelled in turn by an indignant and enraged people, who could no longer bear with their arrogant assumptions. They should have told us all these facts. And, moreover, they should have informed the world of another public and notorious fact, which no one can deny — that, throughout the entire east, these same missionaries are generally looked upon with distrust and even horror, as intriguers, and "wolves in sheep's clothing."[4] Dr. Durbin himself very delicately lets out this secret; as, for example, when he tells us, that "the Greek bishop, his clergy, and his people commenced a violent persecution against their Protestant brethren,"[5] &c. The east is an uncongenial soil for Protestantism; it can never flourish there; it must seek some *colder* and less radiant climate.

The great bane of the Protestant missions in the east, as elsewhere, is their want of unity and concert. One Protestant sect teaches one set of doctrines, another, another; one pursues a particular line of policy, another one diametrically opposite. They thus come into frequent collision with one another; and the result is that they render themselves the laughing-stock of the keen-sighted Orientals, already disposed to look on them with distrust, if not with positive contempt. Dr. Durbin freely admits and even proves, that the recent establishment by the English government of an Anglican bishopric in Jerusalem is entirely a political movement, designed to secure an increased English influence in the east.[1] The oriental Episcopal missions, both those managed from England and those sent out from America, seem to have little care for the *doctrinal* reformation of the Oriental Churches; they take them as they are, and seek only to extend their own influence by laboring to have themselves recognized as brethren; an attempt which has invariably turned out a complete failure. The Protestant missionaries of the American board, on the contrary, profess to aim at the *doctrinal* reform of those churches, but to do it "slowly and imperceptibly;" by the diffusion of Bibles, tracts, &c., among the people, by preaching, and by establishing schools. Their scheme has certainly worked very slowly and imperceptibly; and so far only has it been successful. Dr. Durbin refers as follows to the different modes of operation adopted by the Episcopal and the non-Episcopal missions in Turkey, and to the collision that has taken place between them:

---

[1] Vol. ii, pp. 296-9. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid p 109—note.

[4] We have ourselves had ample opportunity to become acquainted with this fact, having for several years been thrown into constant intercourse with a great number of intelligent individuals, who were natives of almost all the different countries of the east. Their testimony on this subject was uniform and unanimous.

[5] Vol. ii, p. 99.

> "It is to be regretted that they have come into collision with each other in the midst of these ancient churches, and in presence of the Turk. The chief ground of collision is the validity and authority of their respective ministers, involving the vexed question of the apostolic succession. The Episcopal missions claim to have this in common with the Oriental Churches, and on this ground propose a union with them, presenting it as the essential bond between churches. The missionaries of the American board, on the other hand, while they insist on the validity of their orders, regard evangelical doctrine and worship as the essential ground of Christian unity. The one mission appears to aim chiefly at obtaining a recognition of its churches as truly apostolic; the other, at restoring the simplicity and purity of doctrine and worship in the oriental communions. It is most desirable that they should avoid collisions, which might be easily done, by each confining itself to the stations and provinces of which it first took possession, and by refusing to enter into the field already occupied by the other."[2]

It is plain to see that the Protestant missions in the east have entirely failed. But suppose, for a moment, that they should hereafter succeed, even beyond the most sanguine expectations of their friends; what beneficial results would follow? They would scatter throughout the east a hundred new warring sects, in addition to the few which already exist there, and they would thus render confusion worse confounded. Endless divisions would take the place of a comparative unity; and with the warm temperaments and ardent minds of the Orientals, these countless divisions in religion would infallibly lead to bitter feuds, civil broils, and even bloodshed. These would be most certainly the results of Evangelical Protestantism in the east, should it ever be established there, which, however, it never will or can be, for the reasons already indicated. Yes, we repeat it, the only hope for the complete regeneration of the Eastern

---

[1] See vol. ii, p. 288, seqq.

[2] Ibid. p. 298.

Churches lies in their re-union with the Roman Catholic Church. They flourished only so long as they continued in communion with Rome; they can hope for renewed prosperity only by a re-union with the Catholic Church. Thus only would they be brought into contact with the great body of Christendom; thus only could they be protected from a grinding Turkish oppression on the one hand, and the fear of falling into the hands of a no less ruthless despotism — that of Russia — on the other. The Turkish empire is doomed; it must fall; and then the Oriental Churches must either throw themselves into the arms of Catholic Europe, or into the bearish embrace of the monster Nicholas. There is no alternative; for as to Protestantism, it is out of the question.

That the Catholic missions in the east have been, at least to a great extent, successful, and that they have exercised a most beneficial influence on oriental civilization, Dr. Durbin freely admits. He says:

> "These oriental papal communions feel that they are brought into direct sympathy with Europe by their communion with Rome, and hence they affect Frank manners and customs to some extent, and are regarded in the east as approximating the Franks in feelings, interests, and habits. Nor is it to be denied that their intercourse with the Roman Catholic Church *tends to elevate them in the scale of civilization*, as the priests sent to serve them, being generally educated men, diffuse European knowledge as well as manners among them. It is not possible to estimate the success of the Romish (!) missions to the Oriental Churches, but the general fact is clear, that they have divided them all, so that there is in Asia a Papal Greek church, a Papal Armenian church, a Papal church among the Nestorians, a Papal church among the Syrians, and also among the Copts in Egypt. They claim a communion of forty thousand among the Armenians, and fifteen thousand among the Syrians. To each of these papal communions there is a patriarch appointed by the Pope, and confirmed by the sultan."[1]

He forgot to mention the Catholic Chaldeans, who number nearly twenty thousand, and the Catholic Græco-Melchites, who are estimated at more than half a million. Whatever Dr. Durbin says to the contrary, "it *is* possible to estimate the success of the Catholic missions in the Oriental Churches." In Asia alone, the number of Christians in communion with Rome, according to accurate statistical statements lately sent to Rome by the Catholic missionaries, falls little short of a MILLION AND A HALF, most of whom are subjects of the Turkish empire. To these add more than ten thousand in Egypt, and about two hundred and sixty-five thousand within the limits of Turkey in Europe, and the whole number of Oriental Christians in communion with the Pope will amount to a *million and nearly eight hundred thousand.*[2]

We will conclude this paper, already long enough, with one more extract from Dr. Durbin's "Observations in the East." It is taken from what we found the most interesting portion of the whole work, that which gives a minute and detailed account of his visit to the seven Apocalyptic churches referred to by St. John.[1] In the present forlorn condition of nearly all of these churches he beheld a striking fulfillment of the prophecies uttered by the beloved disciple in the name of Jesus Christ. The passage which we subjoin refers to the church of Philadelphia, the only one of the seven, except, perhaps, Smyrna, which is yet standing, at least in anything like its former condition:

---

[1] Vol. ii, p 287.

[2] We leave out of the account the Russian Catholics, who alone are estimated at more than five millions and a half.

> "The promise of divine interposition in the hour of temptation is the distinguishing feature in this letter of Jesus to the Philadelphians; and wonderfully has it been fulfilled for the last eighteen hundred years. The candlestick has never been removed; the angel of the church has always been there. The altar of Jesus has been often shaken, both by the imperial pagan power, when Philadelphia supplied eleven martyrs as companions to Polycarp in the flames at Smyrna, and by the arms of the false prophet, when Bajazet and Tamerlane swept over Asia Minor like an inundation; yet it has never been overthrown. The crumbling walls of twenty ruined churches, and the swelling domes and towering minarets of a dozen mosques, attest the hours of fiery temptation; yet three thousand Christian Greeks, and half a dozen churches still kept in repair, and still vocal with praise to Jesus, attest that he has been faithful to his promise: 'I also will keep thee in the hour of temptation which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth.' Ephesus is desolate, and without a Christian temple or altar; Laodicea is without inhabitant, except the foxes and jackals that prowl amid her circus and her theatres; Sardis is represented by one Turkish and one Grecian hut; a handful of down-trodden Greek Christians worship in a subterranean chapel at Pergamos; but, in the language of Gibbon, 'Philadelphia alone has been saved by prophecy or courage. At a distance from the sea, forgotten by the emperor, encompassed on all sides by the Turks, SHE only among the Greek colonies and churches of Asia is still erect—a column in a scene of ruins.'"[2]

But our author adds:

> "While the Christian traveler is struck with the wonderful preservation of the fundamental Christian faith and worship in Philadelphia, he is saddened when he enters the ancient sanctuaries and witnesses the worship (!) of the Virgin and the adoration (!) of saints, whose rude portraits hang on the walls. Nor is his sadness relieved, when he hears the offices of his holy religion performed in a tongue unknown to the people, who speak the Turkish language only, while the church service is in ancient Greek."[3]

The true Christian traveler, instead of stopping to slander the faith and worship of a venerable apostolic church, wonderfully preserved by a miracle in fulfillment of prophecy, would rather, we think, be struck and edified at the exact coincidence between that faith and that worship, and those of the Roman Catholic Church. The Philadelphians, like all the other Oriental Christians, are evidently more Catholic than Methodist or Protestant; hence the indignation and the sadness of our "Christian traveler." He would do well to learn a little more charity and truth, ere he again venture to write a book of "Observations" on Christian people living in foreign countries.

---

[1] Dr. Durbin visited them all, except Laodicea, which he describes on the authority of other travelers.

[2] Vol. ii, pp. 139, 40.

[3] Ibid. p. 140.

XXXII. ROME,

AS SEEN BY A NEW YORKER.*

New York and Rome—Superficial books—Candid avowal—Inaccuracies—Colonnade in front of St. Peter's—The ball on the dome—St. Mary Major's—Popes preserving ancient monuments—Italian *Ciceroni*—Tricks on travelers—"The lynx-eyed sculptor"—Laughable mistakes—The Jews in Rome—The chair of St. Peter—Religious services in the Coliseum—Rome not sufficiently progressive—Picture of Rome as the capital of Christendom—Artistic genius of Italy—Liberality towards foreign artists—Overbeck—Paintings in churches—Roman churches never closed against worshippers—Roman charity—Beggars—Italian wines—Valuable suggestion—Italian monks—The Vatican—Villa Borghese—Education in Rome—Pope Gregory XVI.—The college of cardinals—General impression made by Rome on our New Yorker.

We took up the little volume of a New Yorker on Rome, with no slight feeling of curiosity to know what a citizen of our commercial emporium would make of the "eternal city," the ancient capital of the Cæsars, and the present metropolis of Christendom. "*Rome as seen by a New Yorker*," we mused, must be a new Rome, altogether different from the old Rome we used to know, and in which we passed so many delightful years of our life. It must be very difficult for one who grew up amid the perpetual changes and daily progress of a city which sprang into existence but yesterday, but has already become a giant, to estimate aright the oldest city in the civilized world, and the most changeless one in modern times. Still more difficult is it, we thought, for a Protestant, reared with hereditary feelings of hostility to the mother church, to take an impartial view, and to form or present a correct estimate of the great center and capital of Catholicity. To perform this task with success, the visitor of Rome should be not only a Christian, but a Catholic; otherwise it were vain to expect that he would enter fully into the spirit of the place or of the people. He may, indeed, see what appears externally, but he cannot be expected to penetrate what is internal; he may examine and describe the mere shell of society; he cannot taste himself, nor exhibit to others the kernel.

Such were our musings and anticipations, when we entered on the perusal of the work before us. Nor were we wholly disappointed. The book is precisely what it purports to be, "*Rome as seen by a New Yorker*;" that is, as the author himself candidly acknowledges in the preface, Rome as seen "with the ideas, prepossessions, and prejudices of an American and a New Yorker." It is also, as he admits with equal candor at the close of the work, a "superficial survey" of the "eternal city," though we could not understand why he adds that it was "necessarily" so.[1] Surely we had already superficial books in abundance, without adding another to the list. Our age is so vastly *enlightened*, that it would really seem as if no book could prove acceptable to it which is not superficial. We are learned enough already; we have little time, and less inclination, to think on difficult subjects, or even peruse those works which undertake to do our thinking for us, by going to the bottom of things.

---

* *Rome, as seen by a New Yorker* in 1843–4.

"Roma! Roma! Roma!
Non e piu come era prima."

New York and London: Wiley & Putnam. 1843. 1 vol. 12mo., pp. 216.

Still the book has its merits, and merits of a high order. It is, in the main, honest, candid, and correct in its statements, as far as it goes; and it is marred by about as little prejudice, whether religious or political, as we could have reasonably expected. Catholics are so much accustomed to misrepresentation and abuse, that they generally feel grateful for very small favors, and are disposed to thank the writer who is honest enough to tell even a portion of the truth, and to abstain even ever so little from indulging in a rancorous and slanderous spirit. Yet we must say, that, with a little more attention and research, our New Yorker might have been more accurate in his descriptions, as well as in his statements of facts. He appears to have occasionally availed himself of a privilege claimed by our countrymen who dwell a little farther north,—of *guessing* at certain things, which he surely should have taken sufficient pains to ascertain with certainty, before he ventured on putting them in his book.

Thus, speaking of the grand colonnade in front of St. Peter's church, he says: "and the two *semicircles* of the embracing colonnade are formed by *three hundred* columns, forty feet high, sweeping around the *piazza* in quadruple rows, and crowned by colossal statues of saints."[2] There are several inaccuracies in this passage. Those sweeping arches are not semicircular, but elliptical; and the *foci* of the ellipsis are carefully marked on the pavement, so that when the spectator stands at either of those two points, the four rows of columns forming the circumference of the ellipsis appear as one. Few *ciceroni* fail to point out this phenomenon to travelers. Again, instead of three hundred, there are two hundred and eighty-four columns, and eighty-eight pilasters, making in all three hundred and seventy-two. We believe, also, that the columns are more than forty feet high; for the colonnade is eighty Roman palms, or about fifty-three of our feet in height. He might have added that the colonnade is eighty-two palms wide, (about fifty-five feet,) and that it is surmounted by one hundred and ninety-two statues of saints, fourteen palms high.[3]

His Yankee shrewdness, though put in requisition, was still more at fault in regard to St. Mary Major's, in which he puts nearly twice as many Ionic columns as had been placed there originally by the architects. He might, perhaps, have succeeded much better in calculating the amount of money annually expended by the Romans in purchasing church can-

[1] Page 204.

[2] Page 12.

[3] For all these particulars, see *Vasi*—Itinerario Istruttivo di Roma. Page 454.

dles. "A Yankee," he says, "would feel inclined to calculate how much money they burn up every year in church candles. The interior of the *basilica* (of St. Mary Major's) consists of an immense nave, divided from the aisles by *seventy* Ionic columns of white marble."[1] *Forty* would have been much nearer the mark.[2]

Speaking of the ball which surmounts the dome of St. Peter's, he says:

> "It is eight feet in diameter, and the guide says that it can hold sixteen people. A prudent man would rather not be one of the sixteen, for with only two friends and myself, it seemed to sway back and forth, and to yield to every gust of wind, and we could readily fancy that the thin sheet of copper of which it is made, might easily give way, or that our weight might topple it down from its proud eminence, and make it bound from lantern to dome, and from dome to roof, till it should at last strike the ground, with its precious contents, four hundred and thirty feet below its starting point."[3]

Now we do not lay claim to any great amount of prudence or courage, yet we can say that, having been one of a party of sixteen who entered the ball together, we entertained none of the apprehensions which tortured the fancy of our cautious New Yorker; but, on the contrary, we fancied that the brave old ball, which had defied the winds for centuries, might still survive our visit.

While he admits that "the later Popes have carefully and judiciously preserved and repaired the tottering walls of the coliseum, and sanctified it from future robberies, by consecrating it to the memory of the crowds of Christian martyrs who have perished in the arena," he very unwarrantably, we believe, charges the earlier Popes with having united with the Roman nobles and plebians, in stealing materials from it for their palaces and houses.[4] History will scarcely sustain this assertion. The coliseum was dilapidated partly by time, partly by the barbarians who so often spread desolation through the city, leveling to the ground its proudest monuments, and transforming it into a vast marble wilderness, and partly by the lawless rapacity of certain noble families, who long used it as a quarry for erecting their stately palaces. So far from its being true that the Popes shared in or even connived at this robbery, we may safely say that it took place in spite of them, and, to a certain extent at least, during their absence at Avignon. The cutting Roman proverb,—"What the *barbarians* did not do, the *Barberini* accomplished,"[5]—while it points a well-merited satire at a certain noble Roman family, tells pretty nearly the whole truth about the causes of the present dilapidated condition of that ancient structure.

We suppose that our author was sometimes egregiously quizzed by certain mischief-loving Roman wags and *ciceroni;* for he tells us some stories which he would scarcely indorse or have us believe. We have occasion to know that there are in Rome, as elsewhere, a good many persons who like to play such tricks on travelers, especially when they fancy that they have found one a little verdant. Some of the Italian *ciceroni* seem to be under the impression that their services are enhanced in value in proportion to the marvels they are able to disclose to their wondering employers; yet, when alone with their own set, chuckle heartily over the credulity that swallowed their stories. We suppose it was some such a wag as this, who recounted to our New Yorker the story which he has carefully put down in his book, about the Roman prince, who, having been long in the habit of pelting the Jews with stones, was requested by the Pope to pelt them rather with fruits or nuts, which recommendation he thought he complied with to the letter, by pelting them thenceforth with the *cones of pine trees!*[1]

---

[1] Page 94.
[2] See Vasi's work, *sup. cit.*
[3] Pages 23-4.
[4] Pages 32-3.
[5] *Quod non fecerunt barbari, fecerunt Barberini.*

On the same principle we may, perhaps, explain the saying of the waiter at a Roman *cafè*, in relation to the Jews of Rome: "Oh, they are very nice people; I can hit them a good rap on the head, and they never say a word back."[2] But we are really at a loss to account for the fact, that one so shrewd as a New Yorker, should have been really led to believe that the Romans suppose all the Americans to be negroes! The grounds of his belief are contained in the following humorous passage, in which he speaks of a young lady whom he met by chance in a crowd assembled at Christmas, near the church of *San Luigi dei Francesi:*

> "She flattered my progress in Italian by guessing (!) me to be a Florentine, but expanded her immense black eyes to an inconceivable size, when she heard that I was from America, and exclaimed, '*Holy Virgin! you are as white as I am!*' In truth, I was rather whiter; but we are here *generally supposed* to be negroes; and the *cafè Americano*, in the *Piazza di Spagna*,[3] has an emblem of our country painted on its sign, in the head of a *blackamoor*, with woolly hair, flat nose, and Ethiopian lips."[4]

We suppose we may set down in the category of blunders, the assertion made by our author, that the famous Greek MS. New Testament, preserved in the Vatican library, dates back only to the *sixth* century:[5] we thought it was considered as old as the *fourth*, having been written out about the time of the first general council, held at Nice in 325. We are even inclined to suspect that our author was a little too credulous, when he believed, not from his own observation, which might easily have assured him of the real state of the case, but on the authority of a "lynx-eyed sculptor" whom he perhaps never saw, that the marks supposed to have been left on a stone, at the spot where Christ met St. Peter retreating from martyrdom, are those of *two right feet;* and that of course all the world was deceived for centuries by a very clumsy imposture, until this cunning sculptor—more "lynx-eyed" probably than Michael Angelo himself—happened to discover what no one had ever before even suspected![6]

Our New Yorker, however, makes some atonement for his occasional blunders, by telling us, in the most good-natured way imaginable, of some laughable mistakes into which he was betrayed in the article of eatables, in which a Yankee is seldom at fault. We give the following extract:

---

[1] Page 140.

[2] Page 141.

[3] This *cafè*, or another of the same name, was located in a different part of the city altogether, a few years ago.

Page 94.

[5] Page 74.

[6] Page 60.

> "There is, however, much uncertainty in this practical course of study, for in my self-instructing experiments, I once ordered *cucuzzole ripiene*, and it proved to be a stuffed gourd! Another day I had been looking at some ancient columns of *Cipollino* marble, and afterwards finding the same name in the dinner list, I called for it from curiosity, remembering that Franklin had made saw-dust pudding, and thinking that the Romans might, perhaps, make marble-dust pie, but the *Cipollino* appeared in the form of fried onions! It was thus that I initiated myself into the mysteries of the Italian kitchen, and you may now profit by my experience."[1]

Had he taken as much pains, and gone through as many "self-instructing experiments," he might have been much better initiated in the higher mysteries of Roman manners, faith and worship. He would then probably have found out, what we are confident every intelligent inhabitant of Rome already knew, that the "mission," given three times a year to the Jews dwelling in the Ghetto,[2] consists of something more than that procession of "hideous ghosts," chanting in lugubrious strains, and sometimes "bursting out into a yell worse than any Indian war-whoop," which he so graphically describes.[3] Had he taken the trouble to ask any of the old or young women or children living in that quarter of the city, they would have informed him, probably with an air of wonder at his ignorance, that the procession which so dreadfully shocked his nerves, was but the preparation for the "mission," which consisted of prayers for the conversion of the Jews, the regular service of the Church offered up for the same purpose, and eloquent discourses delivered by zealous and able men to reclaim them from the error of their ways. And the numerous yearly conversions in Rome even of that obdurate and stiff-necked race, effected under God by the means just indicated, prove that, instead of "being more likely to frighten children into fits than to entice the Jews to conversion," they are admirably suited to that end. The Jews of Rome are, in fact, better treated than they are any where else on the continent of Europe; and this truth is the basis of the current proverb: "Rome is the paradise of Jews."[4] The inscription from Isaiah,—which by the way is placed *opposite*, and not *beside* one of the gates of the Hebrew quarter, and which is, if our memory serve us, also given in Latin as well as in Hebrew, though in both these particulars our author seems to think differently,—is rather a solemn admonition to this rebellious people, than any evidence of a wish "to add insult to injury."[5]

If our readers should be inclined to think that, in noticing all these things, we are insisting too much on trifles, we hope they will form a different opinion of what follows. And first we will say a word on the subjoined extract:

---

[1] Page 128.

[2] The quarter inhabited by the Jews of Rome

[3] Page 142.

[4] Roma e il paradiso dei Judei.

[5] Our author is, we believe, slightly inaccurate in giving the inscription. In Latin it is as rendered by St. Paul (Romans x, 21): "Tota die expandi manus meas ad populum non credentem et contradicentem. All the day long I stretched forth my hands to a people unbelieving and contradicting *me*." Isaiah lxv, 2.

> "At the extreme end of the church (St. Peter's) four colossal statues, representing the principal doctors of the Greek and Latin churches, support a lofty throne and canopy of bronze, within which is preserved the patriarchal chair of St. Peter himself. It is shown to the people only for a moment, on great festivals, and is venerated by them as a true relic of the prince of the apostles; but unbelievers whisper that when the heretical French had possession of the city they found on the chair the Arabic inscription, 'There is but one God, and *Mahomet* is his prophet!' This makes it probable that the chair was brought from Palestine by some of the early crusaders."[1]

We believe it was Lady Morgan who first gave currency to this stupid and unfounded story, which, though triumphantly refuted by Dr. Wiseman and others, is still circulated and *believed* by those who would fain tax Catholics with excessive credulity! The chair upon which the "heretical French" discovered the inscription given above was at Venice and not at Rome; in St. Mark's church, and not in St. Peter's: and we suppose this makes a slight difference, especially as it was well known that that Venitian chair was presented to the church by one of the doges who had received it from the east. But yet Lady Morgan's fabrication was too good to be lost.[2]

We have likewise reason to complain of an unworthy prejudice against our Church, which peeps out occasionally from our New Yorker's pages. Thus he devotes one section to the following very homogeneous subjects indicated in the title prefixed: "Cardinals, monks, beggars, and robbers!" An appropriate juxtaposition truly, and in admirable taste! Again, speaking of the erection by the sovereign Pontiffs of the stations of the cross around the arena of the coliseum, and of the inducements they have thus held out to the faithful to visit the spot as consecrated to the memory of Christ crucified, and of those countless Christian martyrs who here poured out their blood for his sake, he says:

> "The Pontiffs did not consider that this *tasteless obtrusion*, on such a scene, of the symbols of the *present religion* of the city, might sometimes lead the spectator to contrast the modern Romans with their ancestors, and perhaps to attribute part of their present degradation to the influence of the *superstitions* (!) *which are here so palpably thrust upon them.* Although the crimes and cruelties of the ancient Romans made their fall merited, yet their grandeur half excuses (!) their enormity."[3]

We scarcely know which predominates more in this passage, its utter want of taste, or its downright paganism. The author appears himself to have had some misgivings, for before he had got fairly to the end of his account of the fierce blood-thirstiness and remorseless cruelty of the old Roman *plebs*, so often exhibited on this very spot in their frantic shouts for the blood of the Christians, he came to the conclusion that the change which he had so severely censured on the preceding page was after all for the better.

---

[1] P. 15-6.

[2] See Dr. Wiseman's pamphlet in reply to Lady Morgan, in which he clearly and fully refutes her false statement.

[3] Page 33.

"But a *thousand* (he probably means *fifteen hundred*) years have purified the arena, and looking with the eyes of reality in the place of those of fancy, I saw only a procession of veiled nuns, with slow steps, pass unmolested through the arena, each in turn stopping at the cross in the center, to say a prayer for the souls of the martyred,[1] and to give the kiss which secured the promised 'indulgence.' *The warmest admirer of antiquity must confess that the change is much for the better*,"[2] &c.

We might set down the following under the head, "elegant extracts":

"As it (the holy cradle) passed, every one dropped on *their* (bad grammar) knees, and the soldiers and the priests, *the two great nuisances of Rome*, were strangely intermixed in picturesque confusion."[3]

Our author is not pleased with the stationary character of things in the eternal city, and he blames the Roman government for not pushing forward improvements with more rapidity. But surely Rome should not be judged by the same standard as New York or London. If Rome were in the hands of the New Yorkers for but half a century, our word for it, it would at the end of that short period be worse desecrated than it had ever been by Goth or Vandal in the long lapse of centuries. Its ancient monuments would probably disappear altogether, in order that they might not cumber the ground nor thwart speculations in up-town lots; its most valuable paintings and statutes would probably be sold for large sums, in order that the amount might be invested more profitably in commerce; its palaces would be turned into warehouses, and its studios into shops for the Wall street brokers; perhaps the rotunda itself might become a town hall, and even St. Peter's be turned into a state house, and the coliseum into a place for mass meetings:[4] in short, mammon would riot over the ruin of all that is most beautiful, magnificent, and precious in the "eternal city," and the desecration would be justified by the onward spirit of the age!

The impartial traveler should never lose sight of the fact, that Rome is the capital of Christendom, a religious more than a commercial city. And it is highly honorable to the Romans, that they think more of the other world than of this, more of their three hundred and sixty beautiful churches, than of their banks or shops. Rome is, in a certain sense, the great cloister of Catholicity, the austere and essentially unearthly city; her austerity, however, blended with majesty and tempered by mildness. She is very appropriately placed in the center of the dreary Campagna; for environs smiling with verdure would as ill become her gravity, as would the din, workshops, and smoky atmosphere of Birmingham. She is like an oasis in the desert, or like a bright jewel which receives additional lustre from its dark foil. Her purity would be sullied by the foul breath of modern mammonism, and her majestic genius would fly shrieking away from her classic ruins, before the first blast of steam or the deafening noise of machinery. Under the influence of our modern improvements, her attribute of the great monumental city would be torn from her escutcheon; and along with the spirit of the antique she would lose her very individuality, her identity itself. She would be no longer the grand mausoleum of the illustrious dead, nor the gigantic museum of ancient arts and monuments. Her monumental arches of Titus and Constantine, one of them marking the period of the fall of Judaism, and the other that of the great triumph of Christianity after centuries of bloody persecution, might no longer stand to tell of past revolutions, with their voiceless eloquence; nor would the modern Roman be any longer inclined to indulge in the proud boast that his Angelo had lifted up the ancient Pantheon and poised it two hundred feet in the air. Nor would he any longer look up to Saints Peter and Paul as the founders of the modern city, as truly as were Romulus and Remus of the ancient, and by means much more hallowed, because unstained with blood and rapine. The latter were suckled by the wolf, emblematic of the fierce and blood-thirsty character of ancient Rome; the former were nourished with the mystic manna from heaven, and feasted on the Lamb, a fit emblem of the characteristic meekness and mildness of the modern Christian capital.

---

[1] This betrays a woeful ignorance of Catholic doctrine. Catholics never pray for the souls of "the martyred," and the veriest old woman in Rome could have told our author so.

[2] P. 34.

[3] P. 96.

[4] Our author tells us of a New Yorker whose first exclamation on seeing the coliseum was:—"What a place for a mass meeting!"

Much do we regret that our author did not approach his subject with some such expanded ideas as these. In visiting Rome, he should have put off the spirit of a New Yorker, or even of a Byron, and have put on that of a Chateaubriand or a Geramb. He should have gone rather as an humble pilgrim, than as a sight-seeing, fault-finding, and *guessing* traveler. Then would he have been much better able to appreciate many things which he evidently did not understand; and he would have written a book more worthy his lofty theme.

But we now cheerfully dismiss his faults, and turn to his excellencies; and we will present some extracts which afforded us unmingled pleasure in their perusal, as being marked by truth and candor, obtaining the mastery over error and prejudice. Many of these passages are honorable to his head and heart, and prove him to be a man of considerable shrewdness and discrimination. Some of them embody reflections which we have seen in no previous American or English writer on Rome; while others contain avowals which are very valuable, as coming from a Protestant, who often is at little pains to conceal his prejudice.

He pays the following tribute to the artistic genius of modern Italy, and to the liberality of the Roman government in making no discrimination between natives and foreigners in its award of monumental honors; —he is speaking of a wing of the modern Capitol:

"On its ground floor eight rooms are filled with a series of busts of the most illustrious poets, painters, sculptors, architects, engineers, and musicians of modern Italy, and a native's breast must swell with pride when he looks at the long and honorable array. In *the first room* are six busts of *eminent foreigners*, whose genius was considered naturalized by their long residence in Rome; and among them, if his future progress be commensurate with the rank which he has already attained, may hereafter be found the bust of our own sculptor, Crawford."[1]

In another place[2] he furnishes us with an extract from a Roman paper, in which Crawford is highly eulogized, as well as the country which gave him birth, as follows:

> "We hope very soon to learn that the country of this *valorous* sculptor, which raises so many monuments worthy of her power, has made use of the chisel of this young man to honor some of his fellow-citizens, and at the same time herself; and that she has thus shown herself successful *above every other nation*, while it is given to her to exalt with honors and rewards the living who render her glorious, and at the same time to procure by the arts immortality for the dead."[3]

He gives us a very graphic and beautiful sketch of another illustrious foreigner, the German Overbeck, supposed by many to be the first painter in the world, at least since the death of Baron Camuccini:

> "First among the painters is *Overbeck*, the German Raphael, or rather Perugino; for he condemns the *later* manner of the prince of painters, and says, 'when Raphael forsook Perugino, God forsook Raphael.' Another apothegm attributed to him, is that 'no one can be a good painter who is not also a good man.' His own practice realizes his theory. He is a most devout Catholic, and consecrates all his genius to religious subjects, which he treats with the utmost purity and elevation of style, and with a simplicity and freshness which appeal directly to the heart. His studio (in the old Cenci palace) is open to visitors on Sundays for an hour in the afternoon, and each of his pictures preaches an eloquent sermon. He receives you with extreme courtesy, but you feel hushed into reverence by his gracious, introspective, and *saint-like* countenance. 'Himself the great original he draws,' he 'looks into his heart,' and paints. Upon his easel, at my first visit, stood a pencil cartoon of 'Christ reproving the Pharisees,' and the ideal propriety of expression was faultlessly perfect. As I examined the picture, Overbeck stood beside me, gazing earnestly on it, with clasped hands and parted lips, as if he was wholly absorbed in the subject."[4]

He admits the utility of paintings in churches in the following passage, in which he is speaking of the gallery of the Capitol:

> "Many of the pictures are specimens of the early schools of art, hard and formal, yet possessing much simple sweetness. Most of this class are taken from old churches, in which they served as altar-pieces, or as decorations, preserving there the semblances of the saints, and *telling on the walls the stories of sacred history for the benefit of the pious unlearned, who could read them only when thus narrated in this universal language*."[5]

Of the beauty and splendid decorations of the Italian churches he bears the following honorable testimony:

"The readers of travels in Italy become heartily tired of the churches, which are so often commended to their admiration, but they should charitably call to mind that these edifices constitute a very large proportion of the intellectual food of the traveler. Little would need be said of them, if they were *such bare and tasteless barns* as are too many of the houses of worship in America, but in Italy the highest genius of the best architects, sculptors, and painters, has lavished on them centuries of its poetic labors. Kings have left their own palaces unfinished, and devoted their revenues to adorn the abode of the King of kings. The finest minds of the nation have left their impress on these shrines of magnificence; the noblest conceptions of the architect — that poet in stone — have been here imbodied; the painter has summoned his highest skill when called upon to represent some touching event in sacred history for the instruction and improvement of the unlearned devout; the sculptor has here left his masterpieces in the statues of the great men, heroes, divines, and poets — who lie beneath the marble pavement; and every church thus becomes an interesting volume in the history of the past, recording the great deeds of mind as well as of body. The churches of all Catholic countries are generally in the form of a cross.[1] At the extreme end is the high altar, and along the sides are arranged smaller ones (dedicated to various saints), over each of which hangs a sacred picture, oftentimes a masterpiece of art. No pews or benches cumber the marble pavement, but a few chairs are clustered before the altars. THE CHURCHES ARE NEVER CLOSED AGAINST WORSHIPERS, AND ENTER THEM AT WHAT HOUR YOU MAY, YOU WILL ALWAYS FIND SOME DEVOTEES KNEELING BEFORE THEIR FAVORITE ALTARS, AND SEEMINGLY ABSORBED IN THEIR PRAYERS. They are generally old women of the poorer class — for those who find little enjoyment in this world naturally seek for it in another; (!) but at high mass ladies of the highest wealth and birth kneel on the pavement beside the beggar; and at other times a fierce looking man is often seen prostrating himself on the altar steps, and apparently repenting most sincerely of some great crime."[2]

---

[1] Page 23.
[2] Page 191.
[3] Il Tiberino; Giornale Artistico. 17 Feb, 1810.
[4] Page 179-80.
[5] Page 40.

This is saying a great deal for the vital piety and religion of the Romans; much more, we venture to say, than could be said even by a Protestant in favor of the piety of any Protestant country in the world, our own not excepted. And we can testify, from our own observation during a residence of more than four years in Rome, that the above statement far from being exaggerated, falls very much short of the truth. Daily devotion in the churches is not confined to pious old ladies and fierce looking men; it pervades all classes and grades of society.

The Romans are as charitable as they are pious, as the following extract shows:

"But even admitting the faults of the Roman people to be as great and as numerous as their worst detractors charge, they would be made pardonable by their warm-hearted *charity*, 'which covereth a multitude of sins.' Their practical benevolence surpasses that of any other nation. The many poor among them share their mite with the poorer; the very beggar who has been fortunate in his alm-seeking, divides his gain with his less lucky comrade; the rich bestow bounteous and systematic charity; and the number and magnificence of charitable establishments for the relief of suffering humanity are unapproached in any other country of Europe. Hospitals for every form of disease, and for all classes of the wretched, abound in every city, and their inmates are zealously and kindly tended by self-sacrificing sisters of charity, who devote themselves to these painful duties, in the just belief that they are thus rendering the most acceptable religious service. Other charitable offices are performed by various confraternities, similar to the *misericordia* of Florence. Of these, one secretly sends relief to needy but respectable families; another pays off oppressive debts, contracted by the honest poor in times of sickness and accident; another relieves friendless prisoners; another seeks out the sick poor; and another still, when all other benevolent exertions have proved faithless, carries the dead with decent ceremony to the grave. When we find the feelings which prompt these manifold acts of kindness, extending through every class, we can pardon them their transgressions of some other points of the moral law."[1]

---

[1] Rather doubtful; — the existence of lateral chapels does not always prove this.

[2] Pages 45, 46.

Most travelers in Italy complain of the annoyance occasioned by beggars; but had they as much charity as the Italians would seem to possess from the above testimony, they would not be so much annoyed at being asked for an alms in the usual humble and religious manner of the Italian beggars, who always approach you asking a pittance "*per l'amor di Dio* — for the love of God." There is this difference between the Italians and some other *more enlightened* nations, that whereas the former allow the poor to enjoy their personal freedom, and to seek, if they choose, relief from the well known and exhaustless charity of the public, the latter immure them in poor-houses, as if poverty were a crime! Our New Yorker joins in the general outcry against mendicants; but we were almost gratified to find that he was annoyed by English and American, as well as by Roman beggars, and this in Rome itself![2] It seems that English and American adventurers in Italy not unfrequently attempt to levy contributions on their countrymen in this way, and sometimes under false pretexts. We knew of one such case ourselves, in which the mendicant was a New Yorker. Our author did not, it seems, chance to fall in with the merry Roman beggar, who, on being refused an alms under the usual form — "*non c'è, caro mio* — I have nothing my dear sir," — exclaimed, laughing, "I wish I had been born in one of your pockets!" But in the following passage we recognize another old acquaintance, pretty faithfully drawn, with the exception, perhaps, of the decorations borrowed from dame rumor:

"Many of them have regular stations, and the grand flight of steps leading up to the *Trinità dei monti* is occupied by a jolly old fellow, who runs about the landing places on his hands and knees, to which are strapped pieces of wood. He bids a cheerful good morning to every one who comes down or up the *scala*, and clatters up to them[3] on his wooden shod extremities, expressing his pleasure that they are going to have such a fine day to see the beautiful city, and finishing his gossip with the laughing inquiry, 'and how much is your generous excellency going to give me this morning?' Half a cent makes him very contented, and he will readily change a whole one, returning a half cent with profuse thanks. He is said to have become quite rich at this business, and to have lately given his daughter a wedding portion of five hundred dollars."[4]

---

[1] Pages 200, 201.

[2] Page 159-60.

[3] Another grammatical error.

[4] Page 158-9.

Speaking of the Italian wines, our author makes a very judicious remark, which has often struck us with great force, as to the influence of their general use on the great cause of temperance. Drunkenness is a vice almost unknown in France, Spain, Italy, and other wine countries; and we have no doubt that this circumstance, together with the greater cheerfulness and sociability of the people, is owing in a great measure to the general use of wine, not so much as a beverage as an article of diet. He says:

> "The great cause of temperance among us would receive extensive and permanent benefit from the cheap manufacture, from our native grapes, of similar beverages, as harmless, if not beneficial, in their effects, as they are agreeable in their flavor."[1]

He admits also — though we really cannot award him much credit for the admission — that "the monasteries were the asylums of learning during the dark ages;" and adds: "Nothing has been made in vain — not even monks — and few bodies of laymen have left behind them more titles to the gratitude of posterity than the much abused wearers of the monastic robe and cowl." Of the mendicant friars he does not entertain so high an opinion, though he admits that "they conduct themselves with extreme outward propriety, and are seldom seen in the streets after dark, or in any place of public amusement;" and that "though much is said of their immorality, nothing is proven."[2] One would think that Christians, and especially charitable Christians, should not charge on others crimes of a grievous nature, without sufficient proof, and on mere suspicion; yet the contrary practice prevails to a deplorable extent, and this is precisely the reason why most of our fashionable books of travels paint Catholic countries in colors so dark and hideous.

Our New Yorker devotes a chapter to the Vatican, of which he furnishes us with perhaps as good an account as could have been given in so contracted a space:

> "By the side of St. Peter's stands the Vatican palace; and it is a worthy companion of the great cathedral, not so much for its architecture, or its extent, ... as for its unparalleled collections of sculpture and painting. The statues from Greece and ancient Rome, the antique sarcophagi, vases, candelabra, altars, and inscriptions, the paintings of the 'divine Raphael,' and the like, here fill galleries, saloons, halls, and temples, worthy of the priceless treasures, and have all been collected into this focus of splendor by the liberality and taste of successive Popes, who have thus made the Vatican even more famous as a metropolis of art, than it was in former days of the spiritual forge from which were fulminated the terrible bulls against heresies and insubordination, which 'with fear of change perplexed monarchs.'"[3]

Were all these invaluable treasures to be found in England or America, no one would probably be admitted to see them, unless on condition of paying a good round sum for admittance. Thanks to the liberality of the papal government, and to the fact that it has not advanced so rapidly as its neighbors in the *golden* career of enlightenment, this is not the case at Rome, nor in any other Catholic country with which we are acquainted. The curious traveler may visit all the churches, palaces, villas, libraries and museums of Rome, without paying one dollar. Thus the Vatican museum, decidedly the richest in the world, is thrown open to the public on the evenings of two days in each week, Mondays and Thursdays. In the magnificent villa Borghese there is a Latin inscription, of which the following is a translation:

---

[1] Page 129. [2] Page 154-5. [3] Page 67.

> "The guardian of the villa Borghese makes this proclamation: Whoever thou art, if free, do not here fear the shackles of the law. *Go where thou wilt, seek what thou wishest, depart when thou pleasest. These things are prepared for strangers rather than the master.* He forbids me to impose severe restrictions on a well-mannered guest. Let good intents here be the only laws for a friend. But if any one willfully, knowingly, maliciously, should break the golden laws of urbanity, let him beware lest the provoked keeper should in turn break his *tessera* of friendship."[1]

If one of the haughty English aristocracy, or even if one of our own nobility of wealth and rank should issue any such proclamation as this, how we would all stare, and how unmeasured the strains in which his praises would be sounded by every mouth! It would, indeed, be a moral phenomenon; a refreshing exception to the iron-hearted mammonism which freezes the sympathies, withers the feelings, and crushes the very heart of our *enlightened* age.

Our author says that, with the exception of theological study and its cognate branches, "every other species of knowledge is not merely neglected, but positively discouraged;"[2] yet, in almost the same breath, he admits that "instruction in the mere elements of knowledge—reading, writing, arithmetic—and religion is indeed bestowed on the people with great copiousness, since in Rome, with a population of one hundred and fifty thousand, (nearer one hundred and sixty thousand,) there are *three hundred and eighty primary schools*, which employ four hundred and eighty teachers, and receive fourteen thousand scholars;"[3] and he might have added that Rome has, moreover, twenty-four colleges, one university, and many excellent schools of the fine arts. He attempts to explain away this palpable contradiction between his theory and his facts, by the assertion that those schools are "under the direction of the priesthood," who take this singular means to discourage learning and keep the people in ignorance!

Of the late Pope he says:

> "His Holiness, Gregory XVI, is an old man of seventy-eight, with very white hair, and a rubicund face, from which projects a long and red truly *Roman* nose.[4] His benevolence, learning, and honesty of purpose, have secured to him the love and respect of the people in an unusual degree, but he is too feeble and infirm to hope to enjoy it much longer. As he entered he blessed us all, making the sign of the cross in the air with his finger, kneeled a moment before the altar, and was then assisted to mount his episcopal throne. . . . . . Each of the cardinals in turn, with their

---

[1] Page 167.

[2] Page 195.

[3] Page 196.

[4] We believe his nose is neither peculiarly *red* nor *Roman*.

trains unfolded by their valets, slowly walked up to the Pope, kissed his hand (not his toe), and returned to their seats. Then followed the music of the famous Sixtine choir, unparalleled in any other part of the world."[1]

Of the cardinals he says:

"There are seventy cardinals,[2] most of whom were present, and displayed a venerable array of grave, intellectual heads, framed, as it were, in their gorgeous vestments.[3] . . . . Most of them are of a highly dignified and noble presence, but among them was a small, quick moving personage, with a face full of queer knobs and angles, who was pointed out to me as Cardinal Mezzofanti, the most accomplished linguist in the world. He is said to be master of an incredible number of languages, and he speaks English, the most difficult of all, with wonderful correctness. His words are each uttered separately with the most perfect precision, though he says that his only teacher has been Sheridan's Pronouncing Dictionary, and it is by the cadences of his sentences alone that he can be detected as a foreigner."[4]

We can confirm these statements, and we are quite sure that if our author had chanced to make the acquaintance of Cardinal Mezzofanti, his opinion of his prodigious talents would have been even increased.

We had marked several other passages for quotation or animadversion; but we have already transcended our prescribed limits, and we close our notice with the concluding remarks of the author, which contain a sort of *resumè* of his work:

"We have now concluded our survey of the leading objects of curiosity in the eternal city; and, superficial as it has necessarily been, we may yet readily conceive how *each day, which an American passes in Rome, adds a year to his intellectual life.* He comes from a world discovered only three and a half centuries ago, to a city the history of which goes back twenty six hundred years, and which has impressed its characteristics in each epoch of that long period upon still existing reliques, scattered over the vast area once covered by its monuments. Everywhere he is met by thrilling memorials of great events, which he had read of in childhood, as of things of another world. Each day is crowded with incidents; and the differences of customs, and the power of associations, lend a charm to even the most common place occurrences. He finds the flood of new ideas so copious and rushing as to be actually oppressive. His mind is stimulated and heated almost to the excitement of fever. Even in the churches he cannot find relaxation; for the striking ceremonies of the ritual are inconceivably powerful in impressing the soul through the eye and the ear. If he enters even when the altars are deserted by their officiating ministers, his eye will be caught and his admiration aroused by some masterpiece of painting. The fine arts, whose trophies meet him everywhere, indeed create in him a new sense; and, far from palling on his appetite, their beauty grows more and more upon him as his acquaintance with them increases, till they become at last so indispensable to his enjoyment, that their want leaves an aching void in his daily life. The noble language, too, is no small item among his minor pleasures, and he learns to love its very sound, as with a personal affection. The attributes of the people harmonize with it, and he receives constant and exquisite gratification from the general development of beauty and grace, which is an almost universal result of that innate sensitiveness to their elements and their effects, which pervades all ranks. 'With slow, reluctant, amorous delay,' he leaves the paradise of taste, and, although he has learned to prize more highly than ever the political and religious privileges of his own free land, still, when he calls to mind the proud memories which have been inherited by the Romans — the bounties lavished by nature upon their lovely country — the genius and beauty which seem their birthright — what they have been and what they may again be, and, beyond, all doubt, eventually will be — he is tempted to exclaim, in imitation of Alexander to Diogenes: 'If I were not an American, I would be a Roman.'"[1]

---

[1] Page 92. [2] When there are no vacant hats.—ED. [3] Page 91. [4] Page 153.

[1] Pp. 204-5.

XXXIII. THE PAPAL GOVERNMENT.*

The late Roman revolution—Character of Pius IX.—His measures of reform—How received by his subjects—Base ingratitude—Assassination of Rossi and Palma—A reign of terror—Zambianchi and his band of assassins—Mazzini and his idea of liberty—Europe indignant—The Pontiff restored by the Catholic powers—Whose fault was it that Pius IX. did not succeed in effecting political reform?—Monarchy and mob rule—Origin of the papal states—Did the Popes usurp temporal dominion?—Advantages of their being independent sovereigns—Mr. Headley's Outline Sketch——Statistics of the papal territory—The government an elective monarchy—How the administration is conducted—Mr. Headley's mistakes and omissions—Board to redress grievances—The Sacra Consulta—Municipal regulations—Opinion of Lunadoro—The Sacra Ruota—An incident—The advocate of the poor—Charitable and educational institutions cherished by the Papal government.

Almost every one is familiar with the history of the late Roman revolution, which drove the illustrious Pius IX. into exile, and, for a brief period, threatened the papal states with anarchy and utter destruction, moral, financial, and social. Of course, the events themselves, as well as the personages who figured most prominently in them, are viewed differently by different persons, according to the extent of their information, or the amount of their prejudice. We believe, however, that no impartial man, who has at all studied the subject, will be disposed to dissent from the following summary statement of facts.

1. Pope Pius IX. is a man of liberal views and great benevolence of character. His election was hailed with rapturous acclamations by his people. He showed, from the very commencement of his administration, a disposition to do everything in his power to promote the welfare of his subjects. He did not wait to be petitioned; the first of all European sovereigns, he took the initiative in the work of reform, of his own free will and choice. His first official act was the granting of the Amnesty; by which those who had been exiled from his states for political offenses were restored to their country and to the bosom of their families. By this deed of mercy, he indicated at once the liberal policy of his government, and threw himself with confidence into the arms of his people, relying on their gratitude to uphold his throne. But this was only the beginning: measures of civil reform and social amelioration followed one another in rapid succession;—so rapid, indeed, that many sober-minded politicians, who did not place so much reliance on popular gratitude or discretion as did the noble-hearted Pontiff, become alarmed for the conse-

---

* *The Democratic Review. July*, 1844. *Outline Sketch of the Government and Administration of Rome and the Papal States.* By J. H. Headley.

quences. Without heeding the remonstrances of his regular advisers, the Pontiff continued in his career of civil reform, until there seemed to be nothing left to be granted to his subjects in the way of liberal government, unless, indeed, he would consent to descend quietly from his throne, and resign altogether those rights which he had sworn to maintain.

2. How were his liberal and benevolent measures for the public good received and requited? The answer is at hand. The more he gave, the less were his people satisfied; and the very men, to whom he had extended so signal a mercy, were the first to turn dissatisfied agitators and political demagogues! Forgetting the solemn promises they had made on their return from exile, they directed all their powers of intrigue against their sovereign benefactor, and artfully stirred up the populace against him. The tragical sequel is too well known; it is written in letters of blood. The revolution, inaugurated by the cowardly assassination of Count Rossi, the prime minister of the Pontiff, was continued by the assassination of Monsignor Palma, his private secretary, who was shot down almost by his side by an armed and infuriate mob besieging his palace; and it was consummated by the expulsion of the Pontiff, who was forced by ruffian violence to fly from those to whom he had been so signal a benefactor! A reign of terror was now established; and a republic was proclaimed, after the model of that which had caused so many scenes of horror in France in 1792. The armed freebooters of Garibaldi were turned loose upon the holy city; assassination, confiscation of property, and lawless violence were the order of the day. A mortal terror seized upon the hearts of all the good; no man's life nor property was safe. Mazzini had under his orders a band of hired assassins commanded by Zambianchi, to whose tender mercies holy priests of God, and all others whom the new Robespierre deemed obnoxious, were handed over for summary execution, without any evidence of guilt or form of trial! Not in Rome only, but in Ancona, and in almost all the other cities and towns of the Roman States, assassination was the principal weapon wielded by the new government, for enforcing obedience and striking terror into the hearts of all real or supposed gainsayers. Such was the idea these men had of LIBERTY!

3. This state of anarchy and bloody violence could not be of long continuance. All Europe stood aghast at the horrors enacted at Rome, in the hallowed name of *liberty*. The Catholic powers determined at once to put an end to this state of things, by restoring the exiled Pontiff. France, itself at that time a republic, led the way. Garibaldi, with his soldiery, recruited from the disaffected, and red republicans of Italy and of all Europe, made a desperate stand behind the walls of Rome; but nothing could resist the valor and science of the French troops: the rebels were conquered and expelled, and the Pontiff, who had always deprecated bloodshed and raised his voice in favor of mercy, was reinstated on his throne.

Such is a brief summary of facts in regard to the late Roman revolution. Was it the fault of Pius IX., that his liberal policy was not successful?

Was it his fault, that his people, seduced by unprincipled demagogues, were ungrateful for all his kindness, and in requital thereof drove him from Rome? Are we to lay at his door, too, the horrible excesses perpetrated by the self-styled republican party of Rome, both before and after his departure? Was it a crime in him, that he returned to the throne from which he had been so unjustly and disgracefully expelled? It was in the interests of common humanity so flagrantly outraged, rather than of monarchy as against republicanism, that France and the other Catholic powers of Europe decided to reinstate the Pontiff; and those only will blame either them or him, who prefer anarchy to government, and a reign of terror, in which there is no safety to either property or life, to a mild and paternal monarchy which secures both, without greatly infringing individual liberty. Dearly as we prize political liberty, we are free to avow, that we greatly prefer the worst monarchy on the face of the earth — not excepting even that of the Russian Czar — to such a republic as Mazzini and his gang attempted to establish in Rome. Better far be ruled by one tyrant than by a thousand; better the knout of the Czar than the dagger of the hired assassin; better some government, no matter how strong, than anarchy and mob rule, setting all law and all government at defiance.[1]

But was the Papal Government which the Roman revolutionists overthrew, and which has since been restored, with some important ameliorations, so very bad as its enemies have represented? We propose briefly to examine this question in the present paper, in which we shall review the "Outline Sketch" of the Papal Government, written by J. H. Headley in 1844.

For more than a thousand years the Popes have been the temporal sovereigns of a small territory adjoining the eternal city. It is not our purpose, at present, to inquire at any great length into the origin and history of this temporal dominion, to establish its justice, or to assert its utility. Suffice it to say, that no government of Europe, or, perhaps, of the world, can boast a more ancient, a more bloodless, or a more honorable origin, or can ground its claims to justice on more unquestionable titles. The Popes did not usurp this dominion; it was freely bestowed on them by those who had conquered it in a just war against fierce barbarians, who had themselves seized on it by ruthless violence, after having butchered, expelled, or subjugated the original inhabitants. The Popes did not even ambition temporal sovereignty; it was thrust on them by circumstances almost beyond their control.

---

[1] We might easily establish by undeniable evidence all the statements made above in regard to the Roman revolution. On occasion of a late visit to Rome, we had abundant opportunities to become acquainted with the facts, and to hear the general expression of indignation uttered against the monsters, who so cruelly abused the name of liberty. We visited the monastery of Saint Calixtus beyond the Tiber, where the band of assassins headed by Zambianchi had their head quarters; and where they shot without trial all whom Mazzini was pleased to denounce as enemies of the republic. From one pit in the adjoining gardens, the bodies of *eight priests*, who had been thus inhumanly butchered, were taken out after the revolutionary troubles had ceased. Ample evidence establishing the general prevalence of assassination during the revolution is accumulated in a Volume in octavo, entitled: "Fatti atroci dello spirito demagogico negli Stati Romani: Racconto estratto dai Processi Originali—1853—Atrocious facts concerning the demagogical spirit in the Roman States: a statement extracted from the original trials." American readers may also peruse with advantage a work on the subject in two volumes, published by Murphy of Baltimore, styled "The Jew of Verona:" a translation from the Italian, a book of masterly ability. In the number of Brownson's Review for July, 1854, is found a well written article on the subject, from the pen of one who was an eye-witness of the facts he so well relates.

In accepting the splendid donation made by the chivalrous Frank conqueror, Pepin le Bref, they did no injustice to the Greek emperors, hitherto the nominal sovereigns of Italy; for the imbecile and perfidious court of Constantinople had almost entirely abandoned Italy to its fate for nearly two centuries, notwithstanding that its people, massacred or ruined by successive barbarian hordes, continually raised their hands in humble supplication, and cried aloud for succor. Crushed by the barbarians, and abandoned in the hour of their greatest need by their natural protectors, the Italians, especially those in the vicinity of Rome, turned their eyes towards the Roman Pontiffs, who were finally compelled to call in the Franks to settle the affairs of their distracted country. No one, who has read the history of the period in question, will be disposed to question any of these facts.[1]

The Popes have been often accused of inordinate worldly ambition. But there is one circumstance in the history of their temporal dominion, which wholly disproves this accusation. Their territory is as contracted now as it was at its origin, or at any period of its history; it has even been somewhat curtailed of its proportions. The Popes have lost some of their districts and cities; they have gained not an inch of territory by conquest, during the long period of a thousand years. Had they been the ambitious men their enemies represent them, they surely might have greatly extended their dominions during the middle ages, when circumstances bestowed on them great political influence over the affairs of Europe. The truth is, they had no such ambition; unlike most other temporal sovereigns, they were content with what they had. Eminently pacific in their character and policy, they abhorred war, and cultivated the arts of peace.[2] They did not wish to have more civil subjects than their predecessors; they sought rather to promote the temporal happiness of those over whom they already ruled, by adopting a system of wise and moderate government.

We view it as a particular dispensation of divine Providence, that the Popes are temporal sovereigns, and also that their sovereignty extends over so limited a territory. Their dominion is just ample enough to make them independent; it is not sufficiently extended to make them great, powerful, or ambitious, or to impart to them any considerable political influence. Had they been able to rank with the greatest sovereigns of Europe, they might have been too much absorbed in worldly affairs, and might have been induced to neglect the weightier spiritual duties of their office. Had they been in possession of no temporal dominion whatever, they would have become necessarily the subjects of one or another of the great European sovereigns, and would have been in consequence grievously embarrassed in the discharge of their spiritual office as chief pastors of Christendom.

---

[1] Perhaps the best work on this subject is the treatise of Orsi — Del Dominio Temporale dei Papi. 1 vol. 12mo. See also Muratori, Annali di Italia, etc.

[2] Almost the only exception to this remark is Julius II.; but if Julius II. was warlike, it was chiefly to repel the aggressions of the Venitians, who, he thought, were seeking to encroach on his territory

These general preliminary remarks introduce us to the brief essay of Mr. Headley quoted above. This writer offers to the readers of the Democratic Review a rapid sketch of the Papal Government, as it was administered ten years ago. As he does not profess to furnish anything more than a mere "outline" of the more prominent features in "the government and administration of Rome and the papal states," we cannot well blame him for having omitted a great many things which we, however, would have thought very useful, if not wholly necessary, in a sketch of the kind. But we do blame him for having written his essay with so much haste and looseness, for having hazarded some statements either very doubtful, or wholly unfounded in fact; and for having interwoven with his exposition some commentaries of his own, which we deem entirely unwarranted. His production would have been much more satisfactory, had he taken the trouble to inform us concerning the sources from which he derived his facts, and the authorities upon which he relied. From the fact that his statements are, in the main, tolerably accurate as far as they go, we presume that he must have had access to some, at least, of the proper channels of information; and from the additional circumstance, that the spirit in which his remarks are presented is generally unexceptionable, we are led to infer that he was not inclined to garble or willfully to make an improper use of his documents. Yet he has certainly fallen into some important errors, both of omission and commission, which we will feel it to be our duty to point out as we proceed.

He starts out with the following statement:

> "Authors differ as to the number of square miles in the papal states. The government generally makes the superficial area about 13,000 Italian square miles, of sixty to a degree. The raccolta, or census, of 1833, makes the population of this territory 2,732,736. Poor as the inhabitants are, only one third of this territory is cultivated."

Assuming these figures to be correct, we perceive that there are, to each square mile in the States of the Church, 210 inhabitants — a number greater than that of Tuscany, France, England, or any other country in Europe, perhaps, except Belgium. This teeming population subsists almost entirely on the productions of the soil; they export at least as much as they import, and yet we are gravely told that "only one-third of this territory is cultivated!" This great discovery must have been made by some flying traveler from his coach window! We will not pause here to examine the incidental statement, that, in estimating Italian square miles, sixty are reckoned to the degree. This we believe to be incorrect. An Italian is considerably less than an English mile, and every child knows that sixty-nine and a half English miles are reckoned to the degree.

The writer gives us the following account of the distinctive feature in the Papal Government:

> "The government of the kingdom is an elective hierarchy, the Pope being its head. He is chosen by the college of cardinals, whose number is limited to seventy, though it has never yet reached, we believe, that number. When the Pope dies, they are shut up in the papal palace on the Quirinal, and are not allowed to come out, or to communicate with each other, except to cast their ballots, until the Pope is elected. A majority of two-thirds is necessary to a choice, Austria, France, and Spain, having the power to put each its veto on one candidate."

This we believe to be correct, except, perhaps, that portion of it which seems to restrict the election to the Quirinal palace, the usual place of the conclave, and the remark that the cardinal electors are forbidden all intercourse except in casting their ballots. But we will let this pass:

> "The administration of the government," he tells us, "is carried on under the Pope, by a cardinal Secretary of State, and several boards, or, as they are called, congregazioni, viz: the Camera Apostolica, or financial department, the Cancellaria, the Diataria (*dataria?*), and the Penitenziera (*penitenzeria?*), or secret inquisition. . . . . The Cancellaria, mentioned above, is the chancery court, and the Dataria, a court for ecclesiastical benefices. To these might be added the Buon Governo for the municipal police, the congregazione Dei Monti for the public debts, and the Sacra Consulta."

This passage proves to us, that the writer had very indistinct and inaccurate ideas of the complexion of the Papal Government, and of the distinctive characters and functions of the various congregations, or standing committees of cardinals for carrying it on. He makes a sad jumble of those congregations the jurisdiction of which is confined to spiritual and church matters relating to the whole Catholic world, with those the jurisdiction of which is restricted to the temporal business of the papal states. Neither the Dataria, nor, much less, the Penitenzeria, has any thing whatever to do with the Papal Government. The former is a court appointed for inquiring into ecclesiastical matters appertaining to the external forum, and for expediting bulls or briefs regarding matrimonial dispensations and benefices; the latter, which is not an inquisition of any kind, takes cognizance only of cases of conscience connected with the sacrament of penance. Both are councils of advice to the Pope, not as a temporal sovereign, but as spiritual head of the Church; and neither has any thing more to do with the administration of the papal states, than with that of any other state in Christendom.[1]

Nor was the writer more happy, in apprehending the true character of those boards which attend to the administration of merely temporal affairs. Thus he tells us, that the Congregation del Buon Governo was instituted "for the municipal police;" but if this be one of its objects, it is not certainly a principal one. The congregation was established by Clement VIII., not for supervising the police, but for promoting the economical collection and expenditure of the public revenue, especially that accruing from the provinces:[1] and strangely enough, Mr. Headly himself admits this in the very next column of his paper. The chevalier Lunadoro speaks as follows of the objects for which the Buon Governo was instituted:

---

[1] For a full and accurate account of the nature and office of these and of the other congregations, see the excellent work of Lunadoro—Lo Stato Presente, ossia la Relazione della Corte die Roma—2 vols 12 mo. This work was written and published at Rome itself, and it is a standard authority on the matters of which it treats.

> "The duty of the congregation is to ward off and to prevent those evils which might outrage the economy of the state; and for this purpose, it prescribes to the communes the manner of administering their revenues, it examines their condition, the expenses, the alienations of property they make, the obligations they take upon themselves," &c.

And he proceeds to state, that it supervises the imposition of taxes and the collection of the revenue, and decides on all controversies and redresses all grievances in the premises.

There is another congregation for the especial redress of grievances, of which Mr. Headley makes no mention whatever in his *Outline Sketch*; it is that Dei Gravami, or of grievances, established by the energetic Sixtus V. The functions of this congregation are thus sketched by Lunadoro:

> "Their office is to see that subjects be not unjustly oppressed by heavy burdens, imposts, or exorbitant taxes; to investigate the modes in which these exactions are made, to take cognisance of injuries inflicted by tax-gatherers, and of the extortions of commissioners; — and if such controversies cannot be terminated by the congregation, they are referred to his Holiness," &c.[2]

We may also add, that there is a separate congregation, which holds its sessions in the apartments of the treasurer, and the duty of which is to audit and examine the accounts and returns of the public officers.[3] Of this, too, Mr. Headley says nothing. The congregation Dei Monti has more to do with the public savings banks, than with the public debts,— Mr. Headley's opinion to the contrary notwithstanding.[4]

Mr. Headley barely mentions the Congregation della Sacra Consulta, and places it the last on the list of those erected for the administration of the papal dominion. This, too, proves that he had not very accurate information, or very clear ideas, on the Papal Government. The Sacra Consulta occupies, perhaps, the most conspicuous and important position of all the congregations which preside over the papal administration. It possesses both civil and criminal jurisdiction of the most ample kind; it is a high court of appeal, and one of the principal tribunals for the redress of grievances. Lunadoro gives the following account of its functions:

> It has supreme jurisdiction, both criminal and civil; . . . ; it hears the complaints of the people against the governors, presidents, and other officers of the state; it remedies the unjust grievances of the subjects; it hears the complaints of tenants against the local barons, and wisely removes the causes which gave rise to them; sometimes it takes cognizance of controversies arising between neighboring barons . . . ; it watches over

---

[1] See the Constitution of Clement VIII. *Pro commisso*, quoted by Lunadoro—vol. ii, p. 128.

[2] Vol. ii, p. 131.

[3] Id. Ib. p. 132.

[4] Ibid. pp. 129-30

the health of the provinces, and dispenses the necessary orders for warding off from them contagious diseases which threaten them; it makes all the necessary dispositions for securing the tranquillity of the state, in order that it may not be harassed by alarms and tumults, or torn by troubles or enmities; it receives the informations and processes of criminal causes made by the governors and presidents of the state, who are bound to send to it exact accounts; it supervises the proprietorship and administration of lands, castles, and towns, the relative pre-eminence of governors, and superintends the election of public ministers," &c.[1]

We believe that the statement of Mr. Headley concerning the details of the municipal regulations and of the judicial system of the Papal Government, though very imperfect, is in general accurate enough. We can find room for but one or two extracts on this branch of the subject, which takes up the greater portion of his essay:

"These districts are again divided into communes, with their council, corresponding to our common councils, presided over by the town gonfaliere, or mayor, elected out of the council, and holding his place for two years. He is assisted by anziani, or aldermen, from two to six, according to the size of the town, half of whom retire every two years with the gonfaliere, or mayor. This council assesses the rates, &c., and an annual budget is presented them by the mayor, which, after it receives their sanction, is submitted to the delegate, who in his turn sends it to the Buon Governo, which is composed of twelve cardinals and prelates, after which it is returned to the commune and becomes law. The municipal authorities can discharge no account whatever without this formality, and not a dollar can be raised without it, even for local purposes. This is not, perhaps, an ill-balanced system on the whole, and were it not in a tyrannical (!) government, might work well, though slowly. But the difficulty is, one spirit pervades the whole, and the checks on the people are not from the people, but from the Pope, so that there is the semblance of freedom, without its enjoyment."

This remark is as unjust, as it was uncalled for. We have often heard the Papal Government censured for being too lenient, paternal, and inefficient; but this is the first time, until the late attempted revolution, that we remember to have heard it called tyrannical, even by an enemy. Does not Mr. Headley himself assure us, that the taxes are assessed by the council of each commune, and that the budget must "receive their sanction" ere it can possibly become binding? And are not the members of this council from the people, and chosen by the people? Can any government be pointed out in the whole world, which presents so many checks to unjust and exorbitant taxation, or which takes so much pains to prevent the people from being oppressed, or to redress their grievances? And yet we are to be told that it is a tyrannical government! The bulk of the people in the Pope's states, we have reason to *know*, do not think so. Let us hear what Lunadoro, certainly a competent witness, says on this subject:

"This government, though it be an elective monarchy, is believed to be one of the most happy. Holy and wise personages are elected with the special assistance of heaven,—as has been often clearly manifested,—and for this reason it is that, while they confirm the prudent laws of their predecessors, reforming them according to the exigences of the times, while they love the welfare of their subjects, and seek to bestow blessings upon them, to administer justice, and to exalt nobility and virtue, the state is seen to be full of peace, and the people live tranquil lives in the midst of perpetual security."[1]

---

[1] Vol. ii, pp. 119-20.

We will not venture to say that the Papal Government has no faults; were it wholly faultless, it would not be a merely human institution. Faults it has, but they are generally on the right side. Besides those indicated above, and which evidently come under this category, we think that the machinery of the government is too cumbrous and complex; it has too many formalities and too little simplicity, to work with ease or efficiency. But we must remember that it is an old government, and that these forms have been accumulating for centuries. The Roman court is remarkably tenacious of ancient observance and of precedent; it dreads all innovation, even in temporal matters; it proceeds slowly and cautiously in the work of change, and seems to have caught the spirit of Rome's ancient Fabius Maximus, who by wise delay saved his country —*cunctando restituit rem.* But, as we have already had occasion to see, this very cumbrousness of the government machinery is, in a great measure, the result of an anxious wish entertained by successive Pontiffs to ameliorate the condition of the people, and to provide means for redressing their just grievances.

We have never, however, heard of any defaulters under the Roman government; we have never heard of broken banks there, nor of the doctrine of repudiation. And we must have something more than Mr. Headley's bare assertion, before we can believe that it requires "the fifth of the entire receipts to collect the revenue of the government." We cannot believe a syllable of this. The prices of provisions and of labor, as well as the salaries of public officers, are much lower in Rome than in England or this country; the public officers are at least as honest, and the number of them is not much greater in proportion to the population. How then can it be, that the expense of collecting the revenue is so enormous? Mr. Headley admits that the Pope gets only "a small portion" of the three hundred thousand dollars, which he says are annually expended to keep up the court, and that "many an English bishop is better secured in his pecuniary emoluments than the Pope himself." We believe the annual salary of the Pope, as temporal sovereign, is seventy-five thousand dollars; the greater portion of which is, however, expended by him in charitable purposes.

The late illustrious Pontiff Gregory XVI. made most important ameliorations in the municipal administration of the provinces, allowing the people of the communes and città much more ample privileges than they ever had before. The documents containing these improvements were public and official; why is it that Mr. Headley makes no allusion whatever to them?

---

[1] Ibid. vol. i. p. 5. "Ripieno di pace lo stato si vede, e vive il popolo giammai tranquillo in mezzo ad una sicurezza perpetua."

Of the highest tribunal known in the judicial system of the Papal Government,—the Sacra Ruota,—Mr. Headley discourses as follows:

> "If it be decided that the suit shall still be prosecuted, it goes into the Sacra Ruota, formerly the supreme court of Christendom, on whose decisions the civilized world waited with awe and deference. Probably no court of the world has ever had such sway, and commanded such respect as this Sacra Ruota. It still overshadows the Papal states, and extends its influence into the Catholic countries of Europe. It is composed of twelve prelates," &c.

We believe that the Ruota was fully entitled to all the respect and deference it ever received from the Christian world. Its decisions were seldom, if ever, reversed. They were based upon such wisdom and consummate prudence, as no mere human tribunal has ever exhibited. The Ruota knew no exception of persons. It was above princely influence, and it scorned all species of bribery. Its twelve judges, selected from among the most eminent jurists of Europe, were as little accessible to human respect, or undue influence, as any judge that ever sat upon a bench. It furnishes, even now, continual instances of its noble wisdom and disinterestedness. A few years ago it decided a most important case in favor of a poor orphan, and against one of the first noblemen of the state. The people welcomed the decision with shouts of exultation and triumph.

In furnishing details regarding this tribunal, we find that Mr. Headley, as usual, differs widely from Lunadoro.[1] It may be a mere childish prejudice in us, but we candidly admit that, in such grave matters, we prefer to be guided by the Italian chevalier.

In one thing, if in no other, Mr. Headley praises the Papal Government,—for its having had the charity to provide for the defense of the poor in actions at law:

> "Government provides a sort of attorney general, whose services the accused can always command. He is appointed by the Pope, and supported by a salary, and called the *avvocato dei poveri* (advocate of the poor.) This would not be a bad plan for us to adopt. An attorney general to *defend* the poor, rather than one to accuse them, would, we think, better subserve the ends of justice."

This is but one out of a thousand instances of the generous charity of the Roman government towards the poor. The Roman Pontiff is still, what he was in the days of the Leos and the Gregories,—the father of the poor. If he is popular with the Roman people generally, he is doubly dear to the poor. As he passes by, these often raise the cry: "*Santo padre! pane e bajocchi!*"[2] And they never raise it in vain. In cases of famine, drought, pestilence, or any other calamity, the Roman government always manifests a princely charity for the sufferers. Thus, when a few years ago an earthquake visited a portion of Umbria, and spread ruin among the peasantry of a few towns and villages, the Roman government instantly sent twelve thousand dollars for the relief of the sufferers, and the Roman people sent an equally large sum. What noble institutions of charity has not the government scattered through Rome and throughout the whole States of the Church? What character of disease or affliction is there for which it has not provided a comfortable assylum? Perhaps there is no government in the world,—there is certainly no one of the same size and population,—which has founded as many or as splendid charitable institutions. Where else, for example, will you find any charitable institutions equaling the hospital of Santo Spirito, or the Ospizio of San Michele, in Rome? They as much surpass every other establishment of the kind, as St. Peter's church surpasses every other church in Christendom.

---

[1] Vol. ii. pp. 286. 7.

[2] Holy father! Bread and Cents

We are aware that *habeas corpus* is not secured by the modern Roman law, which is, in fact, the old civil law, as modified by the canon law and local statutes. But we cannot believe the statement of Mr. Headley, that in Rome "the suspected person may be imprisoned *merely on suspicion, ad indefinitum.*" If he cannot sue out a regular *habeas corpus*, he may obtain redress in many other ways. As Mr. Headley did *not* tell his readers, there are in Rome tribunals for the redress of *all* grievances, and of that of too long or unjust imprisonment amongst the rest. The mercies of the Roman government are above all its works; and we defy Mr. Headley to produce one single instance, in modern times, of the iniquitous imprisonment he complains of. When the Bolognese territory revolted a few years ago, did not Austria openly complain of the excessive leniency of the Roman government towards the ringleaders of the rebellion? Instead of suffering the death of traitors, as would certainly have been the case in any other European government, they were, with but few exceptions, merely imprisoned for a time or banished the territory! When the Austrian army reached Bologna, and when the French army took possession of Ancona, the proceedings against the disaffected were much more rigorous and summary. Finally, in Rome, there exist regular charitable associations, the leading purpose of which is to visit and console the imprisoned. Where else, in the world, will you meet with such a charity as this?

Mr. Headley admits that "about three-fourths of the children of Rome receive gratuitous instruction;" and yet he asserts, oddly enough, that "education is in a low state, and the ignorance of the poor most deplorable!" He also says, without any warrant whatever, and against the positive facts of the case, that "there is no provision for educating the females!" Has he ever heard of the schools established for this purpose by St. Joseph Calasanzio?

We take our leave of Mr. Headley for the present, hoping that he will not receive in an unkind part anything we have said; and that he will study his subject better, and be more sure of his ground, ere he again attempt to write an "Outline Sketch."

XXXIV. THE PHILADELPHIA RIOTS.*

THE NATIVE AMERICAN PARTY.

Dreadful scenes—Will they occur again?—Signs of the times—*Accident* and *choice*—Fearless Protestant writers—Letter to Mayor Harper—Remote causes of the Riots—Union of hatred—What Catholicity has done for liberty and civilization—And what for this country—Real and nominal freedom—Forecast of Thomas Jefferson—His opinion—Glance at the history of bigotry in the United States—Burning of the Ursuline convent—Rev. Lyman Beecher—And other Protestant ministers—Maria Monk—The Protestant Association—A picture of its spirit and proceedings drawn by a Protestant—Immediate causes of the Riots—Native Americans—"Spare the Bible"—Doings of the party—A slander refuted—True State of the case—*Ex parte* evidence—Attempt to evade responsibility—Agency of the Protestant ministers—Burke's estimate of the Catholic clergy—Address to the Protestant community—And to the Catholics—The Church indestructible.

TEN years have elapsed since the second city of our union was disgraced by riots, which caused murder and arson to walk forth, like hideous specters, in its streets; and for a time threatened to subvert all social order, and to substitute lawless anarchy for conservative government. Hatred of the Catholic religion and of its professors was the cause of these fearful civil commotions; and the Catholic Church became the victim of a violent and bloody persecution, till then unparalleled in the history of the country.

The Catholic beheld the long gathering and long threatening clouds of religious bigotry break at length in a terrific storm over his Church, leaving behind it ruins and devastation which appalled him by their magnitude and atrocity. He was made to witness scenes harrowing to the tenderest feelings of his heart; scenes such as his darkest forebodings would scarcely have anticipated: his churches burned to the ground by infuriated mobs; the ministers of his holy religion threatened with assassination, and trembling for their lives; seminaries of learning, residences of the clergy, valuable libraries, all consumed in the ruthless flames; and, what is far more dreadful still, the solemn quietude and sanctity of the tomb itself invaded, the last sacred resting places of the dead torn up by the hands of the living: and all these atrocities perpetrated in the nineteenth century, in a country which had hitherto justly boasted of its enlightenment and liberality, in a city the second in the union for population and resources, and hitherto deemed the first in point of social order and morality; and all done too in the sacred name of a religion of love, and for the defence of the Bible!

---

* 1 *A Letter on the moral causes that have produced the evil spirit of the times; addressed to the Hon. James Harper, mayor of New York, including a vindication of the author from the infamous charges made against him by James Gordon Bennett, William L. Stone and others.* By the Rt. Rev. Dr. Hughes, bishop of New York. J. Winchester.

2 *Address of the Catholic lay citizens of the city and county of Philadelphia to their fellow citizens, in reply to the Presentment of the Grand Jury of the court of Quarter Sessions of May term*, 1844, *in regard to the causes of the late riots in Philadelphia.* Baltimore: Metropolitan Tract Society.

3 *The Olive Branch, or an Earnest Appeal in behalf of religion, the supremacy of law and social order, with documents relating to the late disturbances in Philadelphia.* Philadelphia: M. Fithian.

4 *Catholicism compatible with republican Government, and in full accordance with popular institutions; or reflections upon a premium treatise issued by the American Protestant Society under the signature of "Civis."* By Fenelon. New York: Edward Dunigan.

5. *The Warning of Thomas Jefferson, or a brief exposition of the dangers to be apprehended to our civil and religious liberty from Presbyterianism.* By Justus E. Moore. Philadelphia: J. Cunningham.

God grant that such scenes as these may never again pollute the soil of this happy republic! Yet we are far from being sanguine on the subject. The signs of the times indicate a spirit of lawless bigotry, precisely similar to that which destroyed our churches in Philadelphia; and this spirit, far from courting concealment, stalks forth boldly in the light of day, and openly avows its settled purpose of putting down Catholicity in this *free* country. The organization of the Know Nothings; the countenance given in many of our principal cities to the violent and obscene harangues of unprincipled street preachers; the disturbances which have thence arisen; the recent destruction of several of our churches in the east; and the late disgraceful riots on occasion of the visit to this country of the Popes's Nuncio, all point to the same result which was aimed at by the Philadelphia rioters. The enemies of the Catholic Church have somewhat changed their tactics, but their spirit has remained the same. Hence it is deemed not inopportune, at the present time, to present again to the American public a rapid survey of the causes which led to the Philadelphia riots, and of the fearful scenes then enacted, together with such reflections thereon as the subject may seem to demand.

This is what the writer of the present paper will attempt briefly to do. Himself a native American, with an ancestry which has been for many generations in the country, and justly proud of the fortunate *accident* which gave him birth in a republic so great and flourishing, he dearly loves and warmly cherishes the institutions of his country. But he at the same time is free to avow that, if native Americanism must be appreciated by the narrow-minded and proscriptive policy lately pursued towards those whom *choice* and not *accident* has made American citizens, and by the incendiary, bloody, and inhuman doings of the truculent faction bearing that name in Philadelphia, he for one would blush to wear it, and would freely resign the glory and privileges of being an American citizen. But, thank God! the native faction, as it was exhibited in Philadelphia, is no index of the true American character; it is rather a foul stain on its noble escutcheon. It is a vile excrescence on the surface of our body politic: beneath that surface there lie solid *strata* of sounder sense and better feeling; yea, mines of rich and priceless value. When the proscriptive and bloody doings of nativism shall have been forgotten, or remembered only with disgust and contempt, the true American character, wise, moderate, liberal and expansive, will still continue to stand forth firm and immovable in its integrity and noble manliness.

At the beginning of our paper we have placed the titles of a few among those publications to which the Riots gave birth. As the contents of these pamphlets are already familiar to most of our readers, it will not be necessary to dwell at any length on their respective characters and worth. Three out of five of them, the last three on our list, are the productions of Protestant pens: and it is highly honorable to the heads and hearts of our Protestant fellow citizens that, while Catholics, through a spirit of forbearance, through prudence, or through well grounded fear, abstained most of them from vindicating their own cause, Protestants stepped forth thus nobly to the defense of their outraged institutions and liberties. Such examples are indeed encouraging in the midst of scenes of such bitternes and strife; when the enemies of Catholicity were so numerous and so active; and when those who did not take an active part in the Riots, in general, either folded their arms and looked quietly on, or perhaps secretly applauded the doings of the mob. The names of the authors of the three pamphlets alluded to should be dear not only to every Catholic in the union, but to every citizen who loves the right, or has chivalry enough left to admire the moral courage which generously and magnanimously volunteers to defend the weak against the strong, a small and trembling minority against an omnipotent and ruthless majority.

To these names we will add that of a man who perhaps deserves as much credit as any of them all; who nobly breasted the storm when at its highest fury; who dared tell the truth in the face of triumphant mobs, and with the threat of ruin hanging over his head; whom neither bribes, nor menaces, nor insults could drive from his position; who dared to beard the lion in his den, and to tell of his sanguinary doings, heedless of his angry roaring: need we name J. STEPHENSON DU SOLLE, the talented, the unwavering editor of the "Spirit of the Times." Honor to the man who thus nobly stood up for the right in the midst of the most adverse circumstances, and at the risk even of his life; who remained faithful to the banner of truth when many other editors either abandoned it altogether by their ominous silence, or, what is still worse, reared in its stead the opposition standard of error and falsehood.

We shall have occasion in the sequel to refer more than once to the publications to which we have just adverted; but we cannot pass farther on, without saying one word concerning the noble and manly, yet temperate and dignified letter of the Bishop of New York to Mayor Harper. Seldom has there appeared, in this union at least, a document more timely, more eloquent, more triumphant, more happy in its effects on the public mind. It was written under a threat of assassination, immediately after the fearful May Riots of Philadelphia, and at a moment when there was every reason to apprehend similar or worse outbreaks in New York. The bishop took just the stand which the emergency required; he assumed the bold and fearless tone which best suits the American character; and his words had almost a magic effect on the popular mind. Never was a document more eagerly sought for or more greedily read; it is estimated that in New York alone one hundred and fifty thousand persons read it within forty-eight hours after its first publication.[1] The effect was almost instantaneous; the excitement which had before reached a maddening height, almost immediately subsided, and New York was saved from the outrages which had just disgraced a sister city.

In his Letter, Bishop Hughes vindicates himself triumphantly from the foul charges made and reiterated against him by an inflammatory and unprincipled press; and he boldly challenges James Gordon Bennett, William L. Stone and others, to establish the contrary of the following propositions:

> "1st *proposition*. I have never in my life done one action, or uttered a sentiment tending to abridge any human being of all or any of the rights of conscience which I claim to enjoy myself under the American constitution.
>
> "*2d*. I have never asked or wished that any denomination should be deprived of the Bible, or such version of the Bible as that denomination conscientiously approved, in our common or public schools.
>
> "*3d*. I have never entered into intrigue or collusion with any political party or individual, and no political party or individual ever approached me with so insulting a proposition.
>
> "*4th*. I have never requested or authorized the 'blackening of the public school books' in the city of New York.
>
> "*5th*. In all my public life in New York, I have done no action, uttered no sentiment unworthy of a Christian bishop and an American citizen."[2]

After putting the same or similar propositions in an affirmative form, and stated them as public, notorious *facts*, which he held himself prepared to prove, he thus boldly addresses his revilers:

> "Now, therefore, James Gordon Bennett, William L. Stone, and ye other deceivers of the public, stand forth and meet Bishop Hughes. But then come forth in no quibbling capacity; come forth as honest men, as true American citizens, with truth in your hearts and candor on your lips. I know you can write well, and can multiply words and misrepresent truth; this is not the thing that will serve you now. Come forth with your FACTS. Bishop Hughes places himself in the simple panoply of an honest man, before the American people. He asks no favor, but he simply asks whether the opinion of Bishop White is true, that with the American people no man can be put down by calumny."[3]

Well, James Gordon Bennett and William L. Stone did attempt "to stand forth:" but we think it will be universally allowed that they proved no match for the bishop; that they dealt in idle declamation and in personal abuse; in "words, words, words;" while *he* called for and dealt in *facts*. The result of the discussion was most happy; it contributed in a great measure to clear away the dark clouds of calumny which had been for years gathering about our great commercial emporium; and it left Bishop Hughes and the Catholics in a proud position.

---

[1] See the New York Freeman's Journal for May, 1844.

[2] Letter, pp. 15, 16.

[3] Ibid. pp. 16, 17.

We cannot dismiss this letter of Bishop Hughes without presenting one more brief extract, in which he beautifully and touchingly alludes to the American flag:

> "I can even now remember my reflections on first beholding the American flag. It never crossed my mind that a time might come when that flag, the emblem of the freedom just alluded to, should be divided by apportioning its *stars* to the citizens of native birth, and its *stripes* only as the portion of the foreigner. I was of course but young and inexperienced; and yet even recent events have not diminished my confidence in that ensign of civil and religious liberty. It is possible I was mistaken; but still I cling to the delusion, if it be one, and as I trusted to that flag on a *nation's faith*, I think it more likely that its stripes will disappear altogether; and that before it shall be employed as an instrument of bad faith towards the foreigners of every land, the white portions will blush into crimson, and then the glorious stars alone will remain."[1]

In attempting to account for the Riots themselves, with all the appalling outrages which attended them, we assume no difficult task. Never was there an effect more clearly traceable to its causes. Between the latter and the former there is as close and necessary a connection, as there is between the application of a match and the explosion of a powder magazine. The inflammatory passions of an ignorant populace were the magazine; religious bigotry and hatred of Catholics the match, and the application of the latter to the former was made by unprincipled demagogues and *ministers of the religion of peace and of love!!*

It would, however, be a false and narrow view of the subject to suppose that the riots were merely the result of a sudden outbreak of the populace smarting under a sudden wrong, and goaded into madness by inflammatory appeals of unscrupulous leaders. Though there was some sudden excitement in the case, and perhaps some wrong to give rise to it, yet it is certain that influences directly leading to such outrages had been long at work in the community; and that without those influences the riots would in all probability never have occurred.

For more than ten years previously the "no popery" cry had been raised from one end of the union to the other; from the cold and puritanical north, to the warm and chivalrous south. The outcry resounded from the pulpit and the press; its notes were fierce and sanguinary; they were worthy of the palmiest days of Titus Oates and of Lord George Gordon, both immortal for the relentless and *burning* hatred they bore their Christian brethren of the Roman Catholic Church. Can we wonder then that it produced similar results? When we reflect how long that bitter outcry continued; how talented and influential and untiring were many of those engaged in raising it; how many different forms and complexions it assumed; now boasting of its zeal for the purity of religion, now parading its solicitude for the preservation of our noble republican institutions threatened with destruction by an insidious *foreign* influence; when we reflect how very unscrupulous were the men engaged in this crusade against Catholicity, how many glaring untruths they boldly published both from the pulpit and the press, how many base forgeries, — subsequently admitted to be such, — they unblushingly perpetrated in the full light of day, and with the intelligence of the nineteenth century beaming in their faces; when we reflect that all this warfare against Catholics was openly conducted with a well concerted action and a regular *conspiracy* among almost all the rich and powerful Protestant sects of the country, with the avowed purpose of crushing a particular denomination, and that this *conspiracy* was kept alive by synodical enactments, by Protestant associations, and by the untiring energy and relentless zeal of perhaps the richest and most powerful sect in the country, which ever appeared as the leader of the movement:— when we reflect on all these undoubted facts, can we be any longer surprised at the fearful scenes which lately set the stigma of everlasting disgrace on the second city of the union?

---

[1] Letter, p. 7.

He that would be surprised at such a result, must be indeed but slightly acquainted with the philosophy of the human heart; must be but little versed in the history of the human race. All that surprises us is, that the Riots were so limited in their ravages, and so soon suppressed. Other countries and other times have witnessed much more dreadful scenes under the operation of causes far more slight: but other countries, gleaning experience from past times, have learned the duty and *necessity* of promptly and efficiently checking whatever might lead to a repetition of such atrocities. And we too will soon learn, if we have not yet learned, this wholesome lesson.

To show that the statement just given is not unfounded or even exaggerated in point of fact, we will here present some Protestant authority on the subject. Our first witness will be the excellent and distinguished author of the "Olive Branch;" believed to be a venerable and eminent clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal church in Philadelphia.[1] He has grown up and lived amidst the scenes which he describes; he had been long a close observer of passing events; he is a competent, and surely an impartial witness. Here is what he says:

> "Distressing as it truly is to record it, yet the truth cannot be disguised, that in a land, the adopted constitution of which, together with all the statutes that have been based upon it, most substantially confers, not a toleration of creeds, but a perfect liberty of religious profession, there have been the most proscriptive measures pursued against a distinct individual communion of Christians, that it has been denounced throughout the length and breadth of the land, that its members have been

---

[1] The same gentleman is believed to be the author of the "Truth Unveiled," and "Catholicism compatible with republican institutions," etc.

hunted and driven like outlaws before popular fury, that its altars have been desecrated, its temples fired by incendiary rioters. No age nor country, since the advent of man's Redeemer, perhaps, has beheld a more vindictive spirit roaming in lawless violence over the world, and with the watchword of religion, than is now seen in this our day, and in our own midst; save and except those primitive times when demons of imperial Rome led on their legions to the massacre of early believers. But it was then the wholesale butchery of Christian congregations by gentile murderers; it is now — may heaven arrest the wicked spirit — it is now the Christian that wars with Christian in worse than heathen fury."[1]

No, we cannot disguise it; it is a sober and afflicting fact that, for many years past, an untiring and systematic effort has been made to put down Catholicity in this *free* and glorious republic; and that this has been attempted too by means the most foul and unhallowed. An attempt has been made by a coalition, as powerful as it is ruthless and bigoted, to shut out from the glorious privileges of our noble constitution a minority of our citizens, who have been guilty of no fault save that of adhering with steadiness, and in the midst of much obloquy, to the religion of their forefathers and of the *forefathers of their very persecutors:* to the religion which stood alone for the first fifteen hundred years of the Christian era in her championship of Christianity and of the Bible; to the religion which, single-handed and alone, struggled successfully for centuries against the old Roman paganism, against the barbarism with which the Northmen overspread Europe, against Mohammedanism which, for a thousand years, threatened the independence and the very existence of the civilized world; in a word, against despotism in every form, and error in every hue and shape; to the religion of the Alfreds, of the Charlemagnes, of the Columbuses, of the Fenelons, and the Las Casas! We cannot disguise it, that for their firm adherence to this venerable and time-honored religion; to this mother of heroes and of statesmen; to this mother of the old republics of the middle ages; to this mother of civilization and of the arts; to this mother who brought *all* the nations of Europe into the blessed light of Christianity from the darkness of paganism: — for the *crime* of revering, obeying, and loving this venerable mother, Catholics have been denounced and branded with infamy throughout our country!

Have we merited this treatment? Did our American Catholic forefathers merit it for us? Who, we would ask, first reared in triumph the broad banner of universal freedom on this North American continent? Who first proclaimed in this new world a truth, too wide and expansive to enter into the head of, or to be comprehended by, the narrow-minded Puritan of New England,— a truth, till then new to all the infant colonies, that every man should be free to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience? Who, while the Puritans of New England, and the religious bigots of the other Protestant colonies, were engaged in persecuting brother Protestants, in boring with red hot irons the tongues

[1] Pages 14, 15.

of the inoffensive Quakers, in burning witches and enacting "blue laws;" — who, we would ask, while these things were going on in most of the early Protestant colonies of North America, *first* proclaimed on this broad continent the glorious principles of universal freedom? Read Bancroft, read Goodrich, read Frost, read every Protestant historian of our country, and you will see there inscribed, on the historic page, a FACT which reflects immortal honor on our American Catholic ancestry, — that Lord Baltimore and his Catholic colonists of Maryland were the *first* to announce, as the basis of their legislation, the great and noble principle, that no man's faith or conscience should be a bar to his holding any office, or enjoying any civil privilege of the community.

And yet Catholics are to be ruthlessly denounced as the allies of foreign despots, as the foes of freedom! When was it known, that a Catholic ever persecuted a Protestant in this country? When was it known, that a Catholic mob ever burned Protestant schools, burned Protestant churches, attacked, at the dead hour of night, defenseless Protestant females, and drove them out from their burning dwellings, amidst hisses and hootings and unmanly revilings? When were Catholics known to burn precious libraries to the ground, or to invade the holy sanctuaries of the dead, in order to satiate their avarice with the ornaments which filial, parental, or conjugal piety, had carefully placed around the last sad abode of the dear departed? When were they known to riot, with fiendish delight and exultation, amidst the ruins which their own fury had strewn around them, and to add insult to injury, calumny to outrages on persons and property? Yes, it must be avowed, our bitterest enemies must avow it, that Catholics have done none of all these things, and that in these things, as well as in many others, the glory and the *burning* shame, are all on the side of their enemies!

At the darkest hour of our revolutionary struggle, when all was gloom and despondency, when the stoutest hearts quailed and dreaded the final issue, who, we would ask, came nobly to our succor, and secured triumph to our otherwise almost hopeless cause? Let it never be forgotten, that while we were engaged in the death-struggle for our independence with a *Protestant* government, and with every odds against us, *Catholic* France came generously to our assistance with her treasury, her fleets, and her armies, and that her liberal aid insured our speedy triumph. Let even blind bigotry never forget this.

What American can soon forget the names of Rochambeau, De Grasse, De Kalb, Pulaski, La Fayette, Kosciusko! Without the aid of these noble Catholic heroes, and of the brave troops whom they led on to victory, would we have succeeded at all in our great revolutionary contest? Men of the clearest heads and of the greatest political forecast, living at that time, thought not, at least they deemed the result exceedingly doubtful.

And, during the whole war of the revolution, who ever heard of a Catholic coward, or of a Catholic traitor? When the Protestant General

Gates fled from the battle-field of Camden, with the Protestant militia of North Carolina and Virginia, who but Catholics stood firm at their posts, and fought and died with the brave old Catholic hero, De Kalb? the veteran who, when others ingloriously fled, seized his good sword, and cried out to the brave old Maryland and Pennsylvania lines, "Stand firm, for I am too old to fly!" Who ever heard of a Catholic Arnold? And who has not heard of the brave Irish and German soldiers who, at a somewhat later period, mainly composed the invincible army of the impetuous "Mad Anthony" Wayne, and constituted the great bulwark of our defense against the savage invasions which threatened our whole north-western frontier with devastation and ruin?

Have all these facts, and many more of a similar kind which might be alleged, so soon passed away from the memory of American citizens? Is dark ingratitude to be the foulest stigma on the character of our own, as it it was on that of most ancient republics? Can Americans so soon forget, that the man who periled most in signing the declaration of independence was a Roman Catholic, and that when Charles Carroll of Carrolton put his name to that instrument, Benjamin Franklin observed: "There goes a cool million in support of the cause?" Can they so soon forget the very honorable testimony which the great and the good Washington bore to the valor, zeal, and services of Catholics during the revolutionary war, and that he named the Irish Catholic Barry the first commodore to form our infant navy? Can Philadelphians have so soon forgotten the name of the Catholic Fitzsimmons, one of their own delegates to the convention which ratified our national constitution?

Alas! all these things *have* been forgotten, or but slightly remembered. How have Catholics been repaid for all the blood and treasure, which they shed and expended to secure our independence? Their services have been requited with outrage and indignity. They claimed no exclusive privileges whatever; all they asked was — what they had ever been willing to award to others — civil and religious liberty. They asked to be put on an equality with their Protestant fellow citizens, with whom they had fought side by side in the great battles of freedom. Did they obtain this just and equitable *right*, which the great Washington, in the letter just referred to, declared was theirs?

To be sure, an amendment to the constitution was adopted, by which congress stood pledged to make no law infringing the perfect freedom of conscience; and most of the states adopted similar articles in their constitutions, from which the dark stain of colonial intolerance was thus, in general, blotted out. But these wise enactments were all on paper; were they sustained and carried out by the spirit of the people?

Had the people been left to themselves, we firmly believe that their intelligence and liberality would have kept pace with legislative enactments. Time was, when everything bade fair to make this a glorious republic, *in deed* as it was *in name*. Time was, when the United States promised to be the peaceful home and happy resting place of the oppressed of every nation, of the exile from every country. Time was, when our young republic presented to the forlorn of every clime the idea of an earthly paradise, in which all were to meet, and commingle, and be happy, on terms of perfect equality; where the voice of contention and strife should not be heard, and where all that were sheltered under the American flag should be as free, as the air which stirred its ample folds.

But, alas! this beautiful vision was soon dissipated, and the poor stranger was awakened to a sense of the sad reality! The serpent of religious bigotry soon entered into this fair paradise, marring its beauty, infecting its hitherto virgin atmosphere with its poisonous breath, and breaking the spell of its sanctuary quietude with horrible hissings. The charm was broken; the stranger *felt* that, instead of being in an earthly paradise, he had been cast out, like his first parents, into a frightful wilderness; that, instead of being at home, he was in a *strange* country, where he was branded as an alien and an enemy.

The far-reaching forecast of the patriot Jefferson enabled him to foresee this sad result of the deplorable combination of causes. The "mystery of iniquity" was already beginning to work even in his day, and his strong mind foresaw and predicted its fatal consequences, and even pointed to the very place in which these results were to be exhibited, and to the very sect to whose agency they were to be mainly attributable? Let us read, and ponder well, the prophetic warning of the statesman who drafted our declaration of independence, and who, whatever we may think of his religious opinions, was, at any rate, a true patriot, and, in this instance at least, something of a prophet:

> The atmosphere of our country is unquestionably charged with a threatening cloud of fanaticism, lighter in some parts, denser in others, but too heavy in all. I had no idea, however, *that in Pennsylvania,* the cradle of toleration and freedom of opinion, it could have risen to the height you describe. *This must be owing to the growth of Presbyterianism.* . . . . . Their ambition and tyranny would tolerate no rival if they had the power. *Systematical at grasping at an ascendency over all other sects* they aim at engrossing the education of the country; are hostile to every institution they do not direct; are jealous at seeing others begin to attend at all to that object."[1]

In another letter to William Short,[2] he thus enlarges on the same subject:

> "The Presbyterian clergy are the loudest, the most intolerant of all sects, the most tyrannical and ambitious; ready at the word of a lawgiver, if such a word could now be obtained, to put the torch to the pile, and to rekindle in this virgin hemisphere the flames with which their oracle, Calvin, consumed the poor Servetus, because he could not subscribe the proposition of Calvin, that magistrates have a right to exterminate all heretics to the Calvinistic creed. They *pant to re-establish by law that holy inquisition, which they can now only infuse into public opinion.*"

It must prove instructive, though it will be painful, to trace the origin, the growth, the progress, and the terrible devastations of the "threatening cloud of fanaticism" of which the statesman of Monticello speaks; and, also, to examine the means employed "to infuse into public opinion" the foul spirit of proscription and persecution. We need not speak at any great length of the *remote* causes which gradually prepared the way for this unhappy state of things; of the hereditary hatred of Catholicity, transmitted as a fatal heir-loom from Protestant sire to son, for the last three centuries; of English bigotry transplanted to our virgin hemisphere; of the "no popery" cry, raised originally by Luther and his associate reformers, and repeated by his followers, in every form and shape, until it has become insipid and stale; of the turbid torrent of calumny and misrepresentation of every person and thing Catholic, rolling on and accumulating strength until, like the waters of another deluge, it has almost overwhelmed the world; of false statements regarding Catholics reiterated from the pulpit and through the press ten thousand times, and, though triumphantly refuted as often, still reiterated with renewed boldness. All these means of tainting public opinion had been long employed with fatal and murderous effect; but people had grown tired of the constant repetition of the same mischievous trickery.

---

[1] Jefferson's Works, vol. iv, p. 358.

[2] Ibid., p. 322.

It was deemed necessary by the American leaders of the "no popery" movement, to season the persecution of slander with some new and more exciting condiments. An occasion soon presented itself in the capital of the cold and puritanical north, where a flourishing branch of the Ursuline convent had been established, having annexed to it a most prosperous female academy, in which the daughters of some among the first families of New England were educated. The old calumnies about the abominations of convents were revived in the commuuity; maddening appeals to the very worst passions of the human bosom were made by reverend preachers from the pulpit; horrible disclosures about a certain escaped nun were gotten up specially for the occasion; the minds of the ignorant were wrought up to the highest pitch of excitement; the sanctimonious already gloated, by anticipation, over the coming devastation; and, in this state of the public mind, a preacher of great talents and reputation harangued the multitude in his meeting-house, till he became hoarse, on the abominations of popery in general, and of convents in particular.

The effect was electrical; it was like applying the match to combustible matter; the congregation organized itself into a lawless mob *at the very church door*, and soon the spectator might have seen, by the light of a splendid literary institution burning brightly in the dead of night, the forms of a vast multitude of fiends in human shape, busy in hastening the destruction of the burning edifice, and *in tearing up the graves of the adjoining cemetery;* and he might have seen too the half clad forms of little girls and of women, as they fled shrieking through that pitiless mob, to take shelter for the night in the adjoining fields!

Well, after all this savage work had been done, a committee of investigation, composed of intelligent Protestants of Boston, examined fully into all the grounds of complaint against the convent, and reported that there was no foundation whatever for any of them all! But the mischief had been done; the spirit of bitter persecution had been "infused into public opinion;" the ringleaders in the riot were acquitted by popular acclamation, and a number of pious and accomplished religious ladies were, for conscience's sake, literally *burned* out of New England!

Shame on this unmanly attack, by night too, on inoffensive females! Those who participated in this atrocious outrage, as well as those who approved it, showed themselves the worthy descendants of those who had burned the witches, exterminated the poor Indians, and enacted the "blue laws." And did not, and does not Massachusetts, at least tacitly, approve of that outrage? Else why has she pertinaciously refused up to this very day, to grant indemnity to the sufferers? Why do the ruins of Mount Benedict "still cumber the summit of Bunker Hill, and cast a dark shade over the soil of Massachusetts?" Why are there *two* monuments on Bunker's Hill, one commemorating the noble first struggle of freedom, and the other the base triumph of bigotry?

But we must hasten on. The Reverend incendiary, who instigated the burning of the convent in Boston, soon left the theater where he had already won glory enough, and traveled westward, to repose under the shade of his laurels! Here, too, he soon distinguished himself by the unscrupulous means he employed to put down Catholicity. He published a book called, oddly enough, a "Plea for the West," but, in reality, a plea for his own pocket, and an inflammatory attack on Catholics, whom he represented as leagued with the despots of Europe in a conspiracy for the subversion of our liberties, as Judge Hall,[1] a distinguished Protestant, abundantly proved at the time, in a searching review of the work. Whether, and to what extent, he succeeded in raising money by his "Plea," we are not able to say:—one thing is certain, the tocsin of alarm which he sounded elicited no responsive echo; and the sound soon died away; people were not yet prepared to be gulled by palpable absurdities.

Something new was now required, or else the "no popery" excitement was in imminent danger of dying out for want of aliment. Accordingly, the old slanders about convents were renewed under more favorable auspices. A wandering preacher picked up a strolling woman in the streets of Montreal, and soon a terrible book of "Awful Disclosures," the scene of which lay in the "Hotel Dieu" nunnery of Montreal, made its appearance in New York. A storm of excitement ensued, and though the book was denounced as a base imposture by *all* the press of Montreal and of Canada, and by nearly all the press of New York, yet two editions, of nearly forty thousand copies each, were rapidly struck off and sold. The sale continued, even after every one had found out that the book was a tissue of base slanders from beginning to end; and it was only after the sales had been completed, and the money coolly pocketed by the preachers—not, however, until after they had tried a suit at law about the division of the spoils — that even the notorious Rev. William C. Brownlee, hitherto the main champion of the book, came out in the "Protestant Vindicator," and quietly acknowledged that the whole was a forgery!

---

[1] In the Western Monthy Magazine, a most ably conducted periodical.

And these men were preachers of the gospel; and the good natured public, though thus basely deceived by them, and gulled out of their money, were still not fully undeceived as to the real character and motives of those men who put themselves forward in the crusade against Catholics. It is said that John Bull is the most gullible of animals; but he has a son named Jonathan, who shows that, in this respect at least, if in no other, he is his father's son.

The Maria Monk speculation turned out so very profitable to those who had embarked in it, that soon there was quite a number of other speculators in the same field. First, the preachers who had charge of Maria Monk, tried to get up another set of "Awful Disclosures," the scene of which was to be placed in the United States; but their plot was detected and exposed, and they signally failed. Then came another *immaculate* lady from Canada, named Frances Partridge; she declared that Maria Monk was an impostor who had usurped her name, and that *she* was the real *Simon Pure.* But this, too, proved an utter failure. Finally, the imbecile renegade Smith came out, and published another book of the kind, called Rosamond Culbertson, teeming with filth and obscenity: but the thing was already overdone; the market was more than glutted; the people were tired of being sported with; and the preachers began to *feel* that their reckless mendacity was recoiling on themselves.

This theme was worn out; something new must be started. But what that something should be, they were sadly puzzled to find out. The old Church had been attacked from the pulpit, attacked from the press, attacked by individual preachers, attacked by whole synods assembled; a regular conspiracy had been organised throughout the union to vilify and abuse her; itinerant lecturers had been employed to traverse the country to preach her down; and itinerant mountebanks had been salaried to distribute among the people obscene or inflammatory tracts against her: — and yet she bravely stood her ground; she seemed to bear a charmed life, and even to flourish under the lash of persecution. The Breckenridges, the Brownlees, the Cheevers, the Bergs, the Sparrys, *et id genus omne,* had made almost superhuman exertions to put down "Romanism;" but the tough old shield of Romanism, which had been proof against stronger missiles, sent by stronger and more skillful hands, for eighteen hundred long years, was proof also against *their* feeble darts, which recoiled upon their own heads. The Catholic Church still stood proudly erect, and whenever she had come into fair and open collision with her motley and jarring antagonists, she had more than maintained her position.

What was to be done? Appeals to the worst passions had been tried, and they had failed; proscription, denunciation, *forgery,* had been tried, and they had all failed. Was the contest to be given up in despair? This would not do. The stern and relentless spirit of Calvinism, which had ever been conspicuous in the anti-catholic warfare, could not brook the thought for a moment. A new and desperate effort must be made; Protestant associations must be formed throughout the country; a systematic attempt must be made to blacken, not only the religion, but the character of Catholics; and they are to be represented as the enemies of God and man. How dare they breathe the breath of life in this free *Protestant* country? How dare they claim equal civil privileges and immunities with the Protestant lords of this blessed Protestant soil? Are they not the base slaves of a foreign despot, the Pope? Are they not the enemies of freedom? Are they not the enemies of the Bible? Can they, under these circumstances, be even tolerated in a *free* country?

Well, the Protestant Association was organized throughout the country; in Philadelphia, its leading men were the most untiring in their zeal, and the most ferocious in their bigotry. About eighteen Protestant preachers, ministers of the God of peace and of love, enrolled their names as members; and the notes of fierce denunciation against Catholics were soon heard to ring from the various pulpits of the "city of brotherly love!"

"Congregations, instead of being taught from the pulpit to adorn their profession by all the lovely graces of the gospel," — it is a distinguished Protestant minister of Philadelphia whom we are quoting, — "by kind and affectionate bearing in the world, by earnest and ever active endeavors to secure for themselves and others the blessings of peace, were annoyed with inflammatory harangues upon the 'great schism,' and upon the 'abominations of the Roman Church.' The Pope, and the Pope, and the Pope, was the beginning and the end of sermons in certain churches, and women and children were frightened with details of him at Rome, whilst they who were of the stature of men were held breathless captives, when they were addressed by these orators on the subject of papal usurpations, and the ecclesiastical domination contemplated by 'antichrist' in America. They were told that there was not a Catholic Church that had not underneath it prepared cells for Protestant heretics; that every priest was a Jesuit in disguise; that the Pope was coming to this country with an army of cassocked followers, and that each would be trebly armed with weapons concealed under the folds of 'Babylonish robes.' Never did Titus Oates detail more horrid conspiracies than did these clerical sentinels; and all that was wanting was the power, and such a judge as Jeffries" (or Calvin), "to make every Roman Catholic expiate his abominable heresy on the scaffold."

The same candid and impartial writer continues:

"It was a melancholy state of affairs which the prosecution of this association brought about in this city, once known and acknowledged to be foremost in social harmony and order. The peace of the community was disturbed; families were made to break asunder the bonds of fellowship; Protestants were warned against associations with Catholics for any purpose; and from almost every desk, on the day consecrated to holy rest, even from the agitation of human passions, intemperate declamations against the 'evils of Romanism,' were sure to be heard. 'No compromise with Rome,' and no peace to her 'degraded subjects,' were the watchwords of these Protestant crusaders. All discussions among themselves were now hushed. The angry passions of differing Christians were stilled, and for the season to be concentrated upon one object with increased energy and force."[1]

The association soon distinguished itself by an unmanly attack on poor Catholic servants, and on the forlorn orphan! Let us hear the indignant rebuke administered by the same reverend gentleman, whose words we have last quoted:

> "In the excess of zeal on the part of its managers, there has been exhibited a perfect contempt for the plainest duties of humanity, a positive disregard to the first principles of morals, and which *barbarous savages would shrink from disobeying*. In the first address issued by the association, the question is formally and calmly submitted to the public—to the Christian public, mark ye—whether Protestants do right when they listen to appeals in behalf of Catholic orphans; and that they may hereafter be guarded in the bestowal of their charities, it is intimated that these orphans may, through wrongly directed benevolence, become priests or nuns. And this has been done in the nineteenth century, in a Christian land, and by Christian ministers! Such are the effects of a blind, sectarian spirit; such the port, and bearing, and manners of sectarian intolerance! Orphans may perish in the highways and ditches, may be cast into lazar houses or prisons, may be denied all sympathy—for sympathy will partake of sin, when directed to fatherless Catholic children—from a holy fear that they may become priests before Christian altars, or cloistered nuns, in after-life! Alas, and alas! what will not blind bigotry do towards closing the well-springs of religion and goodness in the human heart, even after it has submitted to a Saviour's reign?"[2]

This wofully blind bigotry of the Protestant preachers in Philadelphia, reminds us of serpents near the close of summer, when they become blind with excessive venom, and strike recklessly at every object that presents itself, often inflicting mortal wounds on themselves. It forcibly calls to our mind too a graphic picture of bigotry, drawn by the Irish orator, Philipps. Here it is:

> "Bigotry has no head, and cannot think; she has no heart, and cannot feel; when she moves, it is in wrath; when she pauses, it is amid ruin; her prayers are curses; her communion is death; her vengeance is eternity; her decalogue is written in the blood of victims; if she stoops for a moment from her infernal flight, it is upon some kindred rock, to whet her fang for keener rapine, and replume her wing for a more sanguinary desperation."

Notwithstanding the almost superhuman exertions of its leaders, the association soon began to languish, and its discordant notes of hatred were fast dying away. Sober and considerate men of all denominations began to be astounded at the blind malignity of the preachers, who figured in its meetings; they turned in disgust from the loathsome spectacle of Christian ministers openly warring against the widow and the orphan; and they thanked their God that these men were not natives of Philadelphia, but most of them from the cold and puritanical north.

The league against Catholicity was on the eve of its dissolution, when suddenly a new and more exciting element of strife was infused into its almost lifeless body. "The Bible, the Bible! oh! spare the Bible from the foreign papists!" — now became the watch-word of the association. Rumors became rife in the community, that the Catholics wished to exclude the Bible from the common schools; the changes were rung upon this charge from the pulpit and the press; immense meetings were held in the public squares of the city, to defend the Bible from the attacks of "foreign papists," and a new *politico-religious* party was organized, called the Native American, for the special defense of the Bible!

---

[1] Quoted by the author of "The Warning of Thomas Jefferson," from the "Truth Unveiled," the first offering of the Rev. Mr. Goodman on the altar of truth, charity, and peace.

[2] Olive Branch, p. 17, 18.

The new party was headed by a notorious demagogue, "a renegade English Jew," who had left behind him no enviable reputation in the various states in which he had successively sojourned.[1] It held large and tumultuous meetings, and made maddening appeals to the passions of the ignorant; in a word, it became the servile tool, the base, fawning slave of the Protestant Association, ready to do its bidding, and to accomplish all its dirty work![2] The Bible was paraded in processions, as the ensign of the new party, and dark threats were afloat in the community against those who dared, in this *free* country, still to persevere in professing the religion of their fathers. Reverend preachers were seen to desert their pulpits, to come down into the political arena, and to harangue tumultuous multitudes on the "abominations of popery," and on the dangers to our republican institutions from "foreign papists!" The community was thrown into a state of excitement bordering on madness; Catholics, and especially the Catholic clergy, were scarcely safe, either in their persons or their property; and everything was ripe for an outbreak.

The rest of the sad story is known, and we need not dwell on its sickening details. Under the circumstances which we have thus far endeavored feebly to state, it would have been wonderful, indeed, if terrible riots had not ensued in Philadelphia. They did ensue, at two different times, and the ravages they left behind them are thus summed up by the excellent author of the "Olive Branch," already quoted:

"The Native American party has existed for a period hardly reaching five months, and in that time of its being, what has been seen? Two Catholic churches burnt, one thrice fired and desecrated, a Catholic seminary and retreat consumed by the torches of an incendiary mob, two rectories and a most valuable library destroyed, forty dwellings in ruins, about forty human lives sacrificed, and sixty of our fellow citizens wounded; riot, and rebellion, and treason, rampant on two occasions in our midst; the laws boldly set at defiance, and peace and order prostrated by ruffian violence."*

---

[1] He had resided, we are told, in Nashville, Louisville, and Baltimore.

[2] That we do no injustice to the Native American party, in ascribing its origin to the darkest religious bigotry, will appear from the following considerations, in addition to the proofs contained in the text. 1st. A Protestant grand jury openly asserted that the party had originated in a solicitude for the protection of the Bible. 2d. Though the party affected to assail foreigners, yet Irish Orangemen, and other bitter *foreign* enemies of Catholicity, were among its most conspicuous and active members; a dirty Orange flag was placed on the top of the market-house during the Kensington riots; the violent Orange air, "the Boyne Water," was played in triumph, while the flames were consuming St. Michael's church; and a notorious Orangeman was actually paraded through the streets of Philadelphia, in the "temple of liberty," which was carried in procession on the 4th of July. 3d. The speeches of Levin, and those of the other leaders, teemed with abuse of Catholics; this, in fact, was the main staple in which those fiendish demagogues dealt, in order to inflame public resentment! 4th. The very cry of the mob, "To the nunnery! to the church!" proved conclusively which way the party had inclined and taught them to go. This incident alone speaks volumes, as to the end and aim and animating principle of the whole party.

The mischief was all done; the enemies of Catholicity were reveling amidst the ruins of our churches, and a Protestant grand jury, appointed to inquire into the causes of the riots, and composed, we are told, chiefly of Presbyterians,[1] openly laid the whole blame of their origin upon the Catholics, and asserted that the native American party had been formed in consequence of efforts made by "a portion of the community to exclude the Bible from the public schools." The Catholics immediately held a meeting, and an Address, penned by William A. Stokes, Esq., was unanimously adopted, in which the assertion of the grand jury was proved to be utterly false, and totally unfounded in fact, by the combined testimony of the Protestant directors of the public schools. Thus was a base and wicked falsehood, which had been the source of such incalculable mischief, even before it had been indorsed by a Protestant grand jury, nailed forever to the counter.[2] The Catholics stood forth triumphantly vindicated; their enemies who had no answer to give, save their silence and certain vague declamations in their tumultuous meetings, were completely worsted in public opinion; and the members of the grand jury must have blushed for very shame, if they had yet any warm and honest blood tingling in their veins.

To make certainty doubly sure, the 26th annual report of the controllers of the public schools in Philadelphia city and county, officially declared that "no attempt had ever been made by any one in that board, nor had the controllers ever been asked by any sect, person, or persons, to exclude the Bible from the common schools."[3] This official declaration set the question at rest forever, and left the Protestant and Native American bigots no alternative, but to plead guilty, to repent, and to hide their faces with very shame.

The plain state of the case was simply this. The Catholics of Philadelphia, who were taxed for the support of the public schools equally with their Protestant fellow citizens, wished to enjoy equal rights and equal liberty of conscience with them in the education of their children. They claimed no exclusive privilege whatever; they never asked that the Bible should be excluded from the schools, but merely that their own children, if forced to read the Bible at all, might be allowed to use the Catholic version. Nothing could have been more reasonable; and the Protestant directors of the schools thought so. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ!* Hence the bitter rage of the bigots who wished to cram their own exclusive notions down the throats of others; and thought that, because they had a numerical majority, they could have everything in their own way.

---

[1] Jefferson's Warning, pp. 31, 32.

[2] See the certificates appended to the Address.

[3] See Olive Branch, p. 34.

To show how utterly absurd and unchristian was their conduct, let us for a moment reverse the case. Suppose that Catholics had been in a majority, and Protestants in a minority in Philadelphia; and that the former had wished to compel the children of the latter to read the Catholic Bible in the public schools, though their parents strongly remonstrated against it; what an outcry would have been immediately raised! How the preachers would have exclaimed against the tyranny of the Pope, the dungeons of the inquisition, &c. Is there not, in that very Bible about which so much noise was made, some such a maxim as this: — "All things whatsoever you would that men should do unto you, do you also to them?"[1]

It is thus a remarkable fact, and as sad as it is remarkable, that whenever the enemies of Catholicity have succeeded in getting up an extraordinary excitement against it, or in causing it great mischief, they have succeeded by open falsehood and forgery; and by what they have themselves afterwards been compelled, in almost every instance, to admit as such! The Rebecca Reed and Maria Monk forgeries, and this base falsehood about the Bible in Philadelphia, to pass over many other less glaring instances, are all cases in point. One thing alone surprises us, that the people have not sooner found out and more generally distrusted the men, who have so often and so vilely sported with their credulity; men, professing to be ministers of Christ, who, while they charge on Catholics the adoption of the maxim, "the end justifies the means," themselves adopt it and reduce it to practice every day!

What, we would here ask, is to be thought of religious sects, which cannot be defended but by such unhallowed means; and what opinion, on the contrary, should considerate men hold concerning a religion which never has been, and never can be, assailed with any effect, without a resort to falsehood and forgery? What should be thought of a religion, which has always come out unscathed from every ordeal; which slander and persecution have not been able to crush during eighteen long centuries; and which, though nailed to the cross with Christ, will yet always rise again with Christ from the tomb to which her enemies had so triumphantly consigned her! But we must return.

Let us not be told, as the Grand Jury declared, from avowedly *ex parte* testimony, that the Irish Catholics of Kensington disturbed and fired on a quiet and lawful political meeting; and that consequently they alone were to blame for all the subsequent outrages. We know this is the popular view of the subject; and we have even heard of an honorable judge on the bench, who feelingly spoke of the blood boiling in his veins, when he thought of this vile attack of foreigners on native citizens! We know, too, that a portion of the public press sustained this view; but we have lost all confidence in the press, especially in times of great excitement, and when nothing is *to* be gained, and much *to* be lost by telling the *whole* truth.

---

[1] St. Matthew, vii. 12.

The evidence elicited during the trial of John Daly clearly establishes the fact, that the native meeting of Kensington was an armed one, and that it fired first on the Irish. The first shot was fired by a *native*, and the first man wounded was Patrick Fisher, an Irishman and a Catholic. This is abundantly proved by the sworn testimony of Alfred M. Clark, Andrew Hague, Joseph Wood, John Matheys, R. G. Fougeray, William F. Small, George H. Martin, and others; all of them neither Catholics nor Irishmen, nor belonging to any particular party.[1]

That there was some wrong on the part of the Irish residents in Kensington, particularly in the disturbance of the small and paltry meeting of Native Americans on the 3d of May, 1844, we freely admit; and we cheerfully coincide with an able cotemporary in granting that it was an act of rashness, if not of insanity, in the Irish to attend that meeting at all; for they might have known that there their passions would be aroused by wanton abuse of their country and of their religion. But the disturbance was after all only such, as very unfortunately often occurs at meetings where deeply exciting topics are discussed; no fire-arms were used, and the candid will admit that the Irish had very great provocation. As to the story of the American flag being trampled on by Irish papists, it was a wicked and malicious fabrication gotten up for effect, like the falsehood about the Bible. The fact is, the natives were determined to have a fight, no matter what might be the consequences.

But even admitting, for the sake of argument, the truth of the very worst charges alleged against the Irish Catholics by their enemies, what harm, we would ask, had the churches and the altars of the living God done, that they should be burnt down? What harm had the schools and the libraries done, that they too should be ruthlessly destroyed? What harm had the deceased done, that they should be disturbed in their graves? What harm had the Sisters of Charity done, that they should be exposed to unmanly insults in the streets? These questions can be put much more easily than they can be answered. They show at a glance, what were the scope and aim and animating principles of the whole movement. They show that religious fanaticism of the very worst kind was the basis of nativism.

The attempts of the native party to prove, that they had no agency in the outrages that marked the riots are indeed ludicrous enough. Did not their leaders goad the people into frenzy by their frothy declamation and their furious tirades from the press? Did not their organs in Philadelphia excuse, and even openly defend the church burners? While the trials were going on, did not the party make every effort to screen from punishment those among the rioters of their own party who had been arrested? And when the jury rendered the verdict of "guilty" against Isaac Hare, did not murmurs arise in open court, and were not the independent jurymen saluted with hisses and threats of personal violence, on leaving the court room?

---

[1] See their testimony in the "Warning of Thomas Jefferson," p. 24, *et seq.*

These are all stubborn facts, which speak more than volumes of vapid declamation by those who showed themselves so willing to resort to calumny, to forgery. They *forged* a letter purporting to be from Bishop Kenrick to his flock, in order to carry out their wicked purposes. True, the leaders of the party made some efforts to save St. Philip's church from being burned down, during the July riots. But they had discovered that church burning would ruin their party, and they had already so far excited the passions of the populace, that their interposition, feebly and reluctantly given, was insufficient, and the military had to be called in to save the church. The native leaders had raised a storm which they could not control, and calm was not restored but after bloodshed, and treason, and open civil war had rioted in the streets of Philadelphia!

And was not the great leader of the party himself arrested by order of Governor Porter, for violent and seditious articles published in his paper, on occasion of the Southwark riots! Was he not a candidate for the penitentiary, as well as a member of congress? In short, the efforts of the Native Americans to prevent the burning of St. Philip's church, forcibly remind us of a choleric old gentleman, who once, in a fit of rage, set fire to his own house; but afterwards when he discovered the flames progressing, became alarmed, and calling out at the top of his voice, "Fire! Fire!" aroused the whole neighborhood, and had the flames extinguished! So the native leaders had kindled up a raging fire in the bosoms of the populace, which it required the whole executive authority of the state, and the military strength of the city and adjoining counties, to extinguish!

But the worst feature in the whole history of the riots, is the active participation of Protestant preachers in the painful scenes of excitement which led to them. We verily believe that, if fanatical ministers from the north had not been in the city, there would have been no riots. We find preachers, time after time, haranguing the multitudes in the streets; we find preachers, on the very day that the Kensington riots began, preparing and presenting resolutions of a most inflammatory character; we find preachers fanning the flame from the pulpit and through the press; we find preachers, everywhere in Philadelphia, the life and the soul of the riots! It is as lamentable as it is true.

The hypocrisy of these men, was only exceeded by their hatred of Catholics. They pretended an unbounded love of the Bible, while they were trampling under foot the most sacred requirements of the holy volume. They vaunted their love of liberty, while they were lending their influence to have a portion of their fellow citizens deprived of the most sacred privileges and ruthlessly trodden in the dust. They were wont to profess great zeal for the "poor benighted papists;" but when these same "poor benighted papists" once came within the sphere of their influence, instead of attempting to enlighten them, they drove them from their door, and bitterly denounced them as "minions of the Pope," and enemies of republican government! They were forever falsely denouncing the Roman Catholic priesthood for interfering in politics, and ere the sound of the calumny had died away, they themselves were seen descending from the desk into the political arena, and preaching up doctrines which directly led, and which they must have perceived would directly lead to treason, to arson, to murder! O bigotry! how blind and inconsistent thou art! O hypocrisy! how subtle and wicked! No wonder the blessed Jesus, so meek and so gentle on all other occasions, should have dealt in withering invective and in woes, when he rebuked the hypocrisy of the Pharisees.

One of the chief artifices resorted to by the preachers, both before and since the riots, in order to get up or increase the excitement against Catholics, was the constant repetition of the charge that Catholic priests, and especially Irish Catholic priests, exercise an undue political influence over their flocks. Catholics were denounced as the "minions of the Pope," and the old gentleman at Rome was supposed to hold them captive, body and soul, through the agency of the priests. Catholics were represented as the mere slaves of the priests, without whose bidding they could neither move, nor live, nor think.

Now let us see, what one of the most eminent and intelligent Protestants of the last century says, in regard to the relative influence of the Catholic and Protestant clergy over their respective flocks. The vapid declamation of a thousand preachers would not weigh a feather, in comparison with the testimony of such a man as the Rt. Hon. Edmund Burke. The extract we furnish is from a letter of the distinguished Irish orator and statesman to his son;[1] and it treats of the relative influence of the Catholic and Protestant clergy of Ireland. Every one will perceive that his remarks apply with still greater force to the state of things in this country:

> "Gentlemen who call themselves Protestants, (*I do not know what that word means, and nobody ever would or could inform me*) are dupes of their own calumnious representations, which serve to mislead them, and irritate those against whom they are made. In order to render the Catholics contemptible, they have ever represented them as men, in all cases, incapable of forming any ideas or opinions, or even wishes of their own; but that their bodies and souls were at the entire disposal of their priests. These miserable creatures, the zealots of the ascendency, have been fed with this stuff as their nurse's pap, and it is never to be got out of their habit. Their low and senseless malice makes them utterly incapable of forming a right judgment on anything. Such is their notion. But I, who know the Catholics of Ireland better than these gentlemen who never have conversed with them, and who, of course, are more ignorant of the real state of their own country than that of Japan, know that at no time within my observation have the Catholic clergy had a great deal of influence over the Catholic people. I have never known an instance (until a few of them were called into action by the manœuvres of the castles) that in secular concerns they took any part at all."

In another part of the same letter he says, speaking of the Catholic clergy of Ireland:

---

[1] Found in his lately published correspondence, in four volumes.

"At present, being stripped of all adventitious aids, and having nothing but the mere credit belonging to them, I think that, though certainly not without influence (and God forbid they or any clergy should), they have rather less than any other clergy I know. You and I have talked over this matter. To those who are acquainted with the prescript form to which the Church of Rome binds its clergy, both as to opinions and the exercise of their functions (which dogmas, forms, and rules are just as well known to laity as to priests), it will easily appear that they have not that range of influence which doctors have who can teach just what they please, and what they think is most likely, for the time being, to be acceptable and to please the people. No Roman Catholic priest can make a pleasing discovery to his congregation. He and his congregation are bound by the authority of their whole Church in all times and in all countries, whose general and collective authority infinitely lessens the individual authority of every private pastor, as the strictness of other laws lessens the power of individual magistrates. Whereas most of us, who examine critically, feel as little as any of them, and for the greater part, think less about it, and are indeed incapable of doing so, we do and must receive our doctrine from our priest, who himself is not bound up to anything beyond his own ideas; and consequently the mass of us depend more upon the individual pastor."

This paper has already extended to a sufficient length, and yet we have not said one-half of those things which we had intended to say. To those who might be disposed to think that our remarks have been unnecessarily harsh and severe, we beg leave to say that we have thought it better to call things by their true names, and to be plain and direct. We believe that we have hazarded no statement, without the strongest and most incontestable evidence. Of course, we have been compelled to confine our remarks to the general facts and views of the subject we have attempted to treat, and we believe that we can have given offense to none, save those whom every honest man is compelled to offend, if he would tell the truth. If the facts are painful, we have the consolation to say that we did not assist in making them *facts;* we have barely recorded them. Let those look to it who made them.

To our Protestant fellow-citizens we would address, in conclusion, the language of a Protestant writer already quoted:

"In the fullness of a heart deeply wounded by a sense of degradation by the recent horrible events, the writer appeals to his fellow-citizens to cast far from them, and forever, this religious rancor, this sectarian intolerance, this anti-Christian ultraism. What has it not done from the beginning? What woe and ruin and disgrace has it not caused among us, and at our very doors, within the last few months? Enough of blood, assuredly, has been shed; enough of wretchedness and misery brought upon families and individuals. Far and wide-spread enough are the desolations which can be beheld within our borders. Is it not now time to pause and reflect? Are we not called by a voice from the insulted Majesty on high, to stop in our mad career of bold, high-handed iniquity? . . . . . Let pulpits no more ring with terms of reproach and asperity; let the religious periodicals abate their fierce contentions, and let the conductors of the public press be silent on such topics. Let Christians no longer cast about them odious and irritating terms of reproach against any other denomination; no vulgar epithets against our brethren, how far soever removed from us in doctrinal faith. Let us all determine before God, and angels, and men, that, so far as in us lies, we 'will live peaceably with all men;' that we will show the beauty and influence of our Christianity in its power to make all to be our brethren, in bonds of a divine charity. Let us cling to and support the constitution of our country in its just and impartial principles of religious toleration and liberty; and, in a word, let us 'bless them that curse us, and pray for them that despitedly use us and persecute us.'"[1]

We commend this last advice of our blessed Lord, in a special manner, to our Catholic brethren; and we can point to no better example of a compliance with its letter and its spirit, than that presented by the Catholic bishop, clergy, and people of Philadelphia, who, in the midst of trials and sufferings, such as have never before fallen to the lot of any portion of our citizens, have exhibited a patience and forbearance honorable to their holy religion, and worthy of primitive Christianity.

Persecution has ever been the lot of the true Church of Christ; the "disciple is not above the Master;" if the blessed Jesus was persecuted, may not we expect to be? Let us not be discouraged or downcast; if the storms and vicissitudes and persecutions of eighteen centuries have not overturned our Church, the riots of Philadelphia, and a hundred more, will not compass its destruction. If the Diocletians and the Julians, and the Luthers and the Calvins could not destroy our Church, is it likely that its destruction will be brought about by such pigmies as the Bergs, the Brownlees, the Cheevers, the Sparries, and the Breckenridges? The Gordon riots in London were much more terrible and destructive than were the native riots of Philadelphia; but the Gordon riots, instead of annihilating our Church in England, mark the precise date of its incipient growth and prosperity. May we not believe that, with the blessing of God, a similar result will follow the Philadelphia riots? One thing is certain, a God has pledged his solemn word that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against his Church."

---

[1] Olive Branch, p. 20, 21.

XXXV. A CHAPTER ON MOBS,

ANCIENT AND MODERN.

Can Mobs put down truth and virtue?—Nothing new under the sun—Historical retrospect—Past trials and triumphs of the Church—The first Mob crucified Christ—The second stoned St. Stephen—Mobs during the first three centuries—Nero the first instigator of them—Mobs a principal feature in the early persecutions—How they were gotten up—Persecution of slander—Forgery—Early Christians branded as aliens and traitors—Tertullian's pointed sarcasm—Mob spirit contagious—The great Roman Mob under Diocletian—St. Basil's graphic description—Sepulchral monument to Christianity—Fate of the persecutors—Mobs powerless—The Cross triumphant—Unalterable meekness of early Christians under persecution—Mobs since the reformation—Are they not similar in spirit to those directed against Christianity during the first three centuries?—A parting word to American Catholics.

Why have the nations raged, and the people devised vain things? . . . . . . He that dwelleth in heaven shall laugh at them; and the Lord shall deride them.—*Psalm* ii, 1, 4.

Blessed are you when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake; rejoice and be exceeding glad, for your reward is very great in heaven.—*Matt.* v. 11, 12.

In contemplating the appalling scenes presented by the Philadelphia riots, and by those later exhibitions of the mob spirit which have disgraced many of our principal cities, the Christian philosopher is filled with amazement, and is inclined to drop a tear over the sad perverseness of human nature, when its passions are lashed into fury by maddening appeals, and are unchecked by reason or religion. But, however much he may be afflicted at the spectacle, he will not despair. The sacred cause of truth and justice, though trampled under foot, and crushed for a time, will and must ultimately triumph over reckless falsehood and atrocious oppression. The cause of truth, like that of liberty,

"Though baffled oft, is ever won"

The base arts of the slanderer and persecutor sooner or later recoil, with fatal effect, on their own heads; and the indignation which they have temporarily excited against the innocent and the virtuous ultimately falls, with a hundred fold force, on themselves. Truth, obscured and hidden for a time by the dark intervening clouds of prejudice and misrepresentation, always breaks forth again with renewed lustre and brilliancy; even as the sun bursts forth from the clouds which have for a time concealed his beams. Persecution can no more blot out the truth, than clouds can blot out the sun from the heavens.

It has ever been so. The annals of history proclaim the fact, in language not to be misunderstood, that falsehood and brute violence have never yet destroyed a good, nor firmly established a bad cause. Thanks to the wise and benevolent Author of our nature, there is inherent in its constitution a reactive energy, which powerfully stimulates it, when led astray by passion and misrepresentation, to return once more to the right path. And though falsehood, in its fierce and unprincipled grappling with truth, may, even for a long time, seem to retain the mastery, yet truth will, and must, in the nature of things, ultimately regain the ascendency. Philosophy, religion, and history combine to sustain this position.

The wisest of men has said: "There is nothing new under the sun." Human nature has been the same in every age; the same in its passions, in its prejudices, in its capabilities both for good and for evil. If we search the annals of history we will find that recent occurrences, which at first struck us as new and startling, are really but old things under a new form. Similar events have occurred hundreds of times before, and often, too, under circumstances of much deeper atrocity. The Philadelphia riots were bad enough, but they might have been much worse, of much longer continuance, and much more extensive in their ravages. There are many instances in the history of the past, in which the efforts of slander and of brute force to crush the truth have been marked by much greater fierceness, and by much more appalling and wide spread ruin. The Catholic Church has in past ages triumphed, again and again, over much more formidable opposition; she has come out unscathed from much more fiery ordeals. She has triumphed over flood and conflagration, over devastation and ruin, over time and revolution, over barbarian incursion and the desperate efforts made for two hundred and fifty years by the all-powerful iron empire of Rome to crush her; and is it likely that the puny efforts of modern bigots, and the burning of a few of her churches will now put her down? No, no. "He who dwelleth in heaven shall laugh at them; and the Lord shall deride them." He whose word cannot pass away, though heaven and earth may pass away, hath built His church on a rock, and hath pledged His eternal veracity that "the gates of hell shall *not* prevail against it."

To enable our readers the more easily to take this rapid retrospective glance at the past, is the object of this brief Chapter on Mobs. One lesson we will glean, if no other, from this historical retrospect—that we need never despond nor yield even slightly to discouragement under persecution, no matter how galling it may be; no matter how seemingly hopeless, humanly speaking, may be the prospect of escape or redress. Still darker clouds have often hung over the pathway of our Catholic ancestors, and yet they despaired not, and those clouds have passed away. What has been will be again. Persecution has ever been the heritage of truth; it was the lot of Him, the pure and spotless Lamb of God, who was Himself "the way, and the *truth*, and the life." And He foretold that it should be the lot of His disciples; He led us to expect it as a thing of course; He consoled us under its anticipated or present pressure with the golden declaration: "The disciple is not above the Master."

The first Mob of which we read in the annals of sacred history, was that which fiercely clamored for the blood of the Man-God, and made the streets of Jerusalem ring with the maddening and demonical shout: "Crucify him! crucify him!!" The first Mob in Christian times imbrued its hands in the blood of a God, and was guilty of the monstrous crime of deicide! And be it remembered, too, that those who composed that first Mob were goaded into reckless fury by inflammatory appeals made to their worst passions, by men who made a parade of their sanctity, boasted of their superior righteousness, and wore the sacred garb of God's ministers! The awful crime of deicide was committed in the name of religion, for the defense of religion, at the instance of men who were the ministers of religion!

And how was this dreadful result brought about? How was that giddy multitude which had, but five days before, filled the streets of the sacred city with joyous hosannas to the Son of David, so suddenly changed in feeling and sentiment? The change was brought about by the busy circulation of base slanders affecting the character of the Son of God,—slanders as baseless and as wholly unfounded in truth, as they were fatal in their results. What but the shouts of that vile Mob, and the pusillanimous fear of displeasing them and of being deemed an enemy of Cæsar, induced the weak governor of Judea reluctantly to sign the fatal sentence, the crying injustice of which his own conscience fully testified?

But let the disciple of Christ ever bear in mind, for the strengthening of his faith, and for his consolation under persecution, that though a Mob compassed the death of the blessed Jesus, and consigned Him, in fiendish triumph, to the tomb, yet it could not prevent His speedy triumph over death, and His glorious resurrection. In spite of all the watchfulness and precautions of His enemies; in spite of Pharisaic spies and Roman guards, He rose again, as He had clearly predicted, on the third day; He arose to die no more; His triumph was permanent and eternal. In Him truth triumphed most signally over error, innocence over slander, virtue over persecution. And His unalterable meekness and patience under suffering and death, and His glorious triumph over His enemies, present a type of what was subsequently to happen to His disciples and to His Church. The Church might expect to be slandered, to be persecuted, to be nailed to the cross with her blessed Founder and Spouse; like Him, she was to bear all these indignities without a murmur; and like Him, too, she was to arise again, with renewed life and vigor, from the tomb to which her enemies had thought, in the folly of their hearts, that they had forever consigned her. As we shall soon see, the history of the Church clearly establishes this great leading fact.

The next Mob of which we read in sacred history was that which compassed the death of the blessed Stephen, the great Christian protomartyr. This noble youth was privileged, the first of all the disciples of Christ, to drink of the bitter chalice of his divine Master; to show forth *His* meekness and patience under suffering, and to share in *His* posthumous glories. He dazzled all by the splendor of his miracles, and confounded his adversaries by his surpassing eloquence. They were convinced, but not persuaded. Instead of yielding to the truth, they were filled with rage at the triumphant arguments of the young Christian deacon. They were discomfited; they could not answer argument by argument; and hence they summoned to their aid the brute force of an ignorant and excitable multitude.

> "They stirred up, therefore, *people*, and the ancients, and the scribes; and running together, they took him, and brought him before the council. And they set up false witnesses who said: this man ceaseth not to speak words against the holy place and the law. . . . And all they who sat in the council, looking earnestly upon him, saw his face as it were the face of an angel."[1]

The result is known. The noble eloquence and triumphant defense of Stephen availed him nothing; it mattered not that he had "the face," and the eloquence, too, "of an angel:" the Mob whom he addressed, like all other Mobs in ancient and modern times, were both deaf and blind; they were filled with rage at his splendid appearance, commanding eloquence, and unanswerable arguments; and, "hearing these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed with their teeth at him. . . . . . And they, crying out with a loud voice, *stopped their ears*, and with one accord rushed violently upon him. And having cast him out of the city, they stoned him."[2] Stephen, with his last breath, wafted to heaven, which was already open to his view, a prayer for his persecutors and assassins: "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep in the Lord."[3]

We need not dwell on the many fierce Mobs which were excited against St. Paul at Philippi, at Ephesus, at Lystra, and in other places. They are all recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, and they present almost the same features as the other Mobs of which we have already spoken, and as those of which we shall speak in the sequel.

Come we now to the period of the Church's greatest trials and sufferings. During the first three centuries of the Christian era, the sword of persecution was seldom returned to the scabbard. From the time that the imperial monster Nero declared a war of extermination against the Christian name, in the year 64, to the close of the persecution under Diocletian and his colleagues, in the year 313, there was but little respite to the sufferings of the Christians. They were hunted down like wild beasts, by day and by night; they were plied with the rack; they were torn by flesh-hooks and by pincers; they were nailed to crosses; they were cast to wild beasts; they were roasted on gridirons. During that period of two hundred and fifty years, ten successive Roman emperors, wielding the omnipotent scepter of the Cæsars, and controlling the destinies of the world, issued edicts for the total extirpation of the Christian religion from the face of the earth. The execution of those bloody laws was entrusted to willing instruments—to proconsuls, prætors, and governors, scattered over the various provinces of the vast empire —

---

[1] Acts vi, 12, 13, 15.
[2] Acts vii, 54, 56, 57.
[3] Ibid. 59.

to men who panted by their obedience to ingratiate themselves with their imperial masters, and who, besides, often had some private passions of their own, of revenge, of bloodthirstiness, or of avarice, to gratify.

Christians were persecuted chiefly in two ways, by legal prosecution and by mob violence. Both methods were as terrific in their results as they were appalling in their cruelty. The attempt to enforce the iniquitous edicts by the means of law was, in general, but a cruel mockery of even the forms of justice. But, atrocious as it was, this method of exterminating the Christians was too slow in its operation to meet the wishes, or to satisfy the malignity of their enemies. Hence popular violence was invoked, and all who professed the religion of the blessed Jesus were doomed to wholesale massacre at the hands of infuriate Mobs. The first persecution under Nero was carried out by a Mob, and the last persecution under Diocletian was consummated by a series of Mobs. During the intervening period, the most appalling scenes of persecution were precisely those, in which ruthless Mobs figured as the mad executioners of the imperial edicts. We will present a few facts on this subject, to show that we have not misrepresented nor exaggerated in the statements just made.

As Tertullian remarks, with his usual energy and point, it was appropriately permitted by divine Providence, that the bloody Nero, the matricide and the uxoricide, the heartless murderer of his mother Agrippina and of his wife Octavia, should be the first to wage war with Christ and his saints. And we have the authority of the pagan historian, Tacitus, for the fact that Nero began and consummated the persecution by inflaming popular resentment, and by stirring up the ignorant and inflammable Roman Mob against the Christians. Rome had been set on fire, and, ere the conflagration could be arrested, a large portion of the splendid marble city of the Cæsars had been left a shapeless heap of mouldering and smoking ruins. A band of lawless desparadoes, who openly proclaimed that they acted *on authority*, had, by casting firebrands, greatly contributed to extend the flames,

When the Romans awoke from the first stupor of their astonishment, and beheld their noble city in ruins, the well grounded suspicion crossed their minds that Nero himself had ordered the conflagration ! Popular indignation had arisen against the monster, and, to avert it from himself, he immediately resolved to turn it into another channel. For this purpose he employed a number of reckless minions of his own, who openly proclaimed that the Christians had fired the city ; and, to give additional weight to their testimony, and to cause the multitude to believe in their " awful disclosures," they unblushingly stated that they themselves were Christians, privy to all the dark secrets and truculent purposes of that odious body. The artifice succeeded, and the streets of Rome rang with fierce clamors for the blood of the Christians. The terrible sequel is well known. Tacitus, on whose authority we have stated the above particulars, relates in the following words :[1]

---

[1] We have followed the not inelegant but somewhat free translation by Dr. Miley, in his " Rome as it was under Paganism, and as it became under the Popes," vol. i, p. 191-2.

"On their information (of the informers above named,) an immense multitude (*ingens multitudo*) were convicted, not indeed of setting fire to the city, but of being the enemies of the human race. They were put to the most cruel deaths; their torments were imbittered by derision, and turned into sources of sport and merriment for Nero and the *Mob*. They covered their bodies with the skins of wild beasts, that they might be worried and torn to pieces by dogs; they nailed them on crosses, made bonfires of their bodies, having smeared them all over with a mixture of lard and pitch, and fastened them in such a manner on pedestals, or in conspicuous places, that the flames issuing from them served to light up the imperial gardens, and to shed lustre on the games and public entertainments which were blended with the persecution of the Christians. Nero had ordered the imperial pleasure grounds of the Vatican to be thrown open for this exhibition, which was set off by chariot races and other sports of the circus on the grandest scale. Those games were also due to the munificence of the emperor, who appeared himself dressed as a charioteer, by turns careering on the course at furious speed, and mingling with the *Mob* on foot."[1]

The pagan slanderer of the Christian adds that a reaction subsequently took place in popular feeling, and that even the fierce and bloodthirsty Roman Mob was filled with compunction and commiseration on beholding the dreadful sufferings of the Christians. But their compassion came too late; the mischief had been done; the fiercest passions of the human bosom had been unchained against the innocent and the helpless; and an *immense multitude* of the latter had fallen victims to blind popular fury. A fire had been enkindled in the bosom of the Roman populace, far more awful and desolating in its ravages than that which had consumed their fair and queenly city.

Scenes very similar to that just described continued to be enacted over the whole length and breadth of the Roman empire throughout the entire period of the persecutions. From theater and circus, from basilica and forum, the maddening shout went forth: "The Christians to the lions! Death to the Christians!!" The shout was renewed at frequent intervals, and it resounded through the capital and through the provinces, through the towns and the hamlets, through the hills and the valleys of the empire. Everywhere it was the signal for a furious onslaught on the Christians, for their death and extermination. It was not a mere idle threat; it proclaimed the settled purpose to do deadly mischief. Twice was it raised in the streets of Lyons, and twice did those streets run with Christian blood. On the latter of these two occasions, under the emperor Septimius Severus, about the year 202, St. Irenæus, the illustrious bishop of the city, and nineteen thousand of his flock, were butchered by the Mob! Similar scenes occurred about the same time in Africa and the other provinces. They were renewed with still greater fury under Decius, under Maximin, under Valerian, and under Aurelian. As we shall presently see, they became yet more frequent and terrible towards the close of the persecutions under Diocletian.

How are we to account for these astonishing facts? How explain this insatiate fury of the Mob? Had the Christians done anything to merit this treatment, to draw down on their heads this dreadful popular wrath? Was there anything, either in their principles or in their practice, which tended to make them thus odious in the eyes of the populace? Were not their doctrines pure and holy, their lives innocent and inoffensive? Were they not always good citizens, ready to serve in the armies, and to die for their country? Were they not meek and forgiving, and were they not in the habit of praying daily for the emperors, and even for their most bitter persecutors? If so, why were they persecuted and hunted down with a fury so abiding and so relentless?

---

[1] Tacitus. Annal., lib. xv, c. 44.

It requires but a glance at the history of that epoch to answer this last question. The persecution of slander preceded and caused that of mob violence. The Christians were first atrociously slandered, and then set on by ruthless Mobs. Christ had been thus treated, and his disciples were made to drink with him the bitter chalice of suffering for justice' sake. We have already heard the pagan historian Tacitus denominating the Christians "the enemies of the human race;" and, in the same passage, he calls them "a herd of wretches addicted to flagitious practices." Another cotemporary pagan historian, Suetonius, denominates their holy religion "a pernicious superstition." The most atrocious charges were openly made, and widely circulated against them by their pagan enemies. They were branded as atheists, as enemies of God and man; as "foreigners," and as secret enemies of the Roman empire. They were charged with infanticide, and with banqueting, Thyestes-like, on human flesh in their secret assemblies. According to the testimony of St. Justin, martyr, certain Jewish emissaries, out of deadly hatred to the Christian name, first originated and published this atrocious slander, which was immediately seized on and circulated with avidity by the pagans, particularly by Porphyrius, Celsus, and others.[1] It was even decorated with all the pretended revolting details of the horrid deed. The Christians were charged with first killing the infant, then drinking its innocent blood, and afterwards feasting on its mangled limbs sprinkled with flour! They were also charged with the commission of the most obscene and revolting crimes in their assemblies; of crimes which their holy religion forbade them even to think of, and which St. Paul would not have named among Christians!

Every circumstance, no matter how trivial, was eagerly seized on to give plausibility and currency to these base slanders. The Christians were often compelled by imperial and popular violence to abandon the cities, and to fly to caverns and to the catacombs from the face of their persecutors. There, shut out from the light of day, they had to celebrate the divine mysteries in secret and in darkness. This circumstance was greedily taken hold of by their pagan slanderers, to add through it a yet deeper dye to their atrocious calumnies. The catacombs had long been the place of resort and concealment for runaway slaves, for lawless banditti, and for dark conspirators. The Christians, driven by hard necessity and cruel oppression to take shelter likewise in those hideous abodes, were openly stigmatized as the friends and associates of ruffians and outlaws! Mob violence pursued them even to the catacombs. They were branded as a *latebrosa et lucifugax natio* — "a furtive crew, mute in public, but garrulous in holes and corners, ever seeking concealment and shunning the light of day, because their practices were dark, and their worship made up of inhuman and incestuous orgies." [1]

---

[1] See St. Justin. Dial., cum Tryphone, No. cxviii, p. 208. Edit. Venet., 1747. See also, for this and similar charges, Minutius Felix, Nos. 9. 10. 30, 31, and Athenagoras' and Tertullian's Apologies.

The shout often went forth from the circus and the theater: "*Areæ non sint!* Let the catacombs be destroyed!" And on more than one occasion the Christians were pursued by the Mob to their dismal retreat under ground, and were overwhelmed and suffocated with sand, while engaged in the holy sacrifice, by the filling up of the portion of the catacombs in which they were known to be, while all possibility of egress was precluded by closing up the entrance! The learned antiquary, Aringhi, has preserved, in his splendid work on the Roman catacombs, an inscription which he discovered in the cemetery of Callixtus. With simple and touching pathos, it paints the intense anguish of the Christians, who could not be safe in their holy worship even in the caverns of the earth; and could not even there enjoy the blessed privilege of burying their dead in peace! [2]

To inflame still more the popular mind against the Christians, *forgeries* of the basest and most mischievous character were concocted and circulated throughout the empire. To this class belonged the forged acts of Pilate, replete with horrid blasphemies against Jesus Christ, which were fabricated about the beginning of the fourth century. In order that the tender minds of youth might be poisoned with hatred of the very name of Christian, those infamous acts were spread everywhere and introduced as a class book into the elementary schools. In addition to all this, the persecutors of the church induced even abandoned females to forge and circulate certain "awful disclosures," concerning deeds of darkness which they pretended to have witnessed themselves among the Christians!!

Eusebius, the father of church history, bears testimony to all these remarkable facts. We will adduce his evidence on the subject. We need not add that his authority is unexceptionable, as, in addition to its intrinsic weight, the facts he alleges occurred in his own day, during the reign of the tyrant Maximian:

"Having forged, therefore, certain acts of Pilate, respecting our

---

[1] See "Rome under Paganism and the Popes," vol. i, pp. 218, 219.

[2] Aringhi, *Roma Subterranea.* We subjoin the touching sepulchral inscription:

"O tempora infausta!
Quibus inter sacra et vota
Ne in cavernis quidem salvari possumus.
Quid miserius vita!
Sed quid miserius in morte,
Cum ab amicis et parentibus
Sepeliri nequeant!"

Saviour, full of every kind of blasphemy against Christ, these, with the consent of the emperor, they sent through the whole of the empire subject to him, commanding at the same time by ordinances in every place and city, and the adjacent districts, to publish them to all persons, and to give them to the schoolmasters to hand to their pupils to study and to commit to memory, as exercises for declamation. Whilst these things were doing, another commander, whom the Romans call *Dux*, in Damascus, a city of Phœnicia, caused certain infamous females to be seized from the forum, and threatening to inflict torture upon them, he forced them to make a formal declaration, taken down on record, that they had once been Christians, and that they were privy to the criminal acts amongst them; that in their very churches they committed licentious deeds; and innumerable other slanders, which he wished them to utter against our religion. Which declarations he inserted in the acts, and communicated to the emperor, who immediately commanded that those documents should be published in every city and place."[1]

The same grave historian assures us, a little afterwards, that the imperial edicts against the Christians were inscribed on tables of brass, which were erected in all the cities of the empire. And he adds:

"The boys also in the schools had the names of Jesus and Pilate, and the acts forged in derision, in their mouths the whole day."[2]

But there is yet one other consideration, intimately connected with the bitter persecution of slander of which the early Christians were the victims, and essential to a full understanding of the implacable hatred with which they were hunted down by the pagan Mob. Under the old Roman empire there was an intimate union of church and state. Superstition and idolatry were closely connected with the affairs of the commonwealth; they were blended with the arts of peace and the pursuits of war: they were intertwined with the splendid ceremonies of the triumphant pageant in commemoration of victory: they were interwoven with the rise, the progress, the victories, and the glories of pagan Rome. Paganism was ingrafted on the Roman body politic: its superstitions and idolatrous rites were welded into the iron frame-work of Roman jurisprudence. As Rome advanced in her all-conquering career, and added new provinces to her empire, she adopted also the divinities and superstitions of the conquered. The gods of the newly conquered territory were borne in the triumphal procession decreed in honor of the victorious commander; and, after they had contributed to swell the pageant, they were by a decree of the senate enrolled among the tutelary deities of the empire, and enthroned in the temples, the forum, or on the capitol. Thus, as St. Leo the Great beautifully remarks, Rome, after conquering the whole word, adopted, and became the willing slave of all the varied errors and superstitions of the whole world. Rome was a kind of Pandemonium — a sanctuary for all the false divinities of paganism.

But though pagan Rome was thus liberal in patronizing error, she was rigid in enforcing obedience to the decisions of her senate and the provisions of her ancient laws. One of those laws, inscribed on the twelve tables, strictly prohibited any one from privately worshiping new or strange gods, or any other than those that the senate might sanction and enroll.[1] This law was held sacred, and was rigidly enforced.

---

[1] Ecclesiastical History, b. ix, ch v. American translation — New York, 1842, p. 384.

[2] Ibid. ch. vii, p. 385.

It bore down with dreadful effect on the Christians, who would not, and could not consent to bow down to the false idols of paganism. For this non-conformity they were represented as the sworn enemies of the gods who had led the Roman arms to victory and the Roman city to empire; they were painted as atheists, as enemies to the country, as "foreigners," originally from a distant and contemptible province of the empire, "alien" in heart and affection to its political and religious institutions, as traitors nestling in the bosom of society, only that they might inflict a mortal wound on their benefactors, as the causes of the vengeance of heaven, and of all the misfortunes which happened to the empire. "If the Tiber rise, or the Nile do not," says the terse and pointed Tertullian; "if an earthquake or drought occur, the Christians are still the cause."[2]

With all these powerful influences at work against the early Christians, with all these bitter elements infused into the persecution of slander directed against them, can we wonder that they became odious and that they fell victims to popular violence? Can we wonder at the butchery of the Christians in the cities and towns by armed Mobs thirsting for their blood? Can we wonder that this same spirit should have entered into the army itself, carrying proscription and death to those among the brave defenders of the country, who *dared* worship Jesus Christ, and to refuse adoration to the gods of the empire?[3] Can we wonder at the decimation and massacre of the noble Theban legion, composed entirely of Christians, under the emperor Galerius? Can we wonder that, when wholesale massacre could not extirpate the Christian soldiers who already filled the imperial armies, these brave men were degraded, and sent to work in the mines and catacombs, like vile slaves and malefactors, and there, amidst taunts and derision, to wear away their lives in incessant toil day and night, badly clothed, badly fed, and shut out forever from the light of day?[4] Can we, indeed, with all those facts in view, wonder at any atrocity perpetrated against the Christian name?

The Mob spirit is essentially contagious and progressive. At first it may be only a spark; but, if not speedily extinguished, it will soon become a mighty conflagration, consuming every thing in its progress. The history of Mob violence in every age and country establishes this leading feature and fact. The experience of the past proves that a Mob is like a menagerie of fierce wild beasts, which, when once let loose upon society, and lashed into fury, may do much more mischief than could have been reasonably anticipated, and may turn their violence on their keepers themselves. Those who recklessly unchain the fierce passions of a Mob, raise a storm the fury of which they cannot themselves control.

---

[1] This singular law, as quoted by Cicero de Legibus, runs thus: "Separatim nemo habessit deos; neve novos, neve advenas, nisi publice adscitos, privatim colunto."

[2] *Apologia.*

[3] See Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. b. viii, ch. iv, pp. 321, 322, edit. *supra.*

[4] See a graphic passage of the pagan historian, Diodorus Siculus, on the hardships endured by such convicts, quoted by Dr. Miley, "Rome under paganism," &c. vol. ii, p. 58.

The history of the Roman empire during the latter half of the second, and the first half of the third century, presents a remarkable instance of this fact. The Roman emperors and governors had recklessly excited and kept alive Mob violence against the Christians: they had encouraged and cherished this demoniacal spirit, in order through it to crush Christianity: and this spirit once called forth and put in motion preyed upon the vitals, and threatened the very existence of the empire itself! It took possession even of the army; it set legion against legion in a death struggle for the mastery; it made the Roman emperors themselves mere puppets in the hands of the Prætorian guards! During the ninety-two years which elapsed after the death of the emperor Marcus Aurelius, there were no less than *thirty-two* emperors elected, and most of them murdered by the soldiery, besides *twenty-seven* pretenders to the imperial purple! And but for the great conservative influence of Christianity, firmly resisting this all-destructive Mob spirit, under the reigns of the great Christian emperors, Constantine, Gratian, and Theodosius, there is little doubt that the empire would have fallen a victim to internal dissensions, even before Goth, Vandal, or Hun ever crossed its frontiers.

We have already extended our remarks on the leading features of the early persecutions to an almost unwarrantable length; but we must yet solicit the patience of our readers, while we say a few words on the last, most protracted, and most dreadful persecution of all: that under Diocletian and his three colleagues. The eloquent Lactantius says that, during the ten years of its continuance, four fierce wild beasts were let loose on society, and raged with appalling cruelty from one end of the empire to the other. It was the last great death struggle of paganism against Christianity: it was the last desperate effort that was made to crush the religion of Jesus by brute violence.

It was specially too, a persecution of Mobs. A Roman Mob proclaimed it in the capital of the empire; Mobs scattered through the provinces kept it up and consummated it, every where burning churches, burning the sacred books, burning whole Christian towns and cities, *together with their inhabitants*, and fiendishly shouting and exulting amidst the ruins their blind fury had strewn around them. We will speak of the beginning of the persecution in the language of an eloquent living writer.[1] The scene he paints occurred in the Circus Maximus at Rome, on occasion of the return of the emperor from a visit to Africa.

> "It was on the kalends of May, in the year of redemption 303, during one of those paroxysms of brutal excitement, that the terrific shout, so often heard in circus and amphitheatre before, resounded from the infuriated myriads, as they arose by a simultaneous impulse — 'Away with the Christians!' *Christiani tollantur!*' was *twelve* times repeated by a chorus of *four hundred thousand* blood-thirsty voices. This was followed

---

[1] "Rome under Paganism," &c. sup. cit. vol. ii, p. 70, 71.

by *ten* rounds of 'death and extermination to the Christians!' '*Christiani non sint!*'"

The emperor willingly listened to a clamor which but embodied his own spirit; was perhaps prompted by his agents and minions. The persecution was accordingly proclaimed; and soon the Roman empire was drenched in Christian blood.

> "Nothing was to be heard but the clanking of chains, the mournful and piteous wailing of young boys, aged men, and tender virgins, as they were inhumanly dragged, with blows and with every insulting outrage, before the judges; for these and their ferocious satellites were insensible to every sentiment of respect for either the infirmities of age or for virginal modesty. The prisons were crowded with holy confessors, so that other public buildings were appointed to receive them. How wanton was the cruelty of the heathens towards the martyrs, we learn from one species of torture mentioned by St. Jerome: 'The Christian,' says this father, 'was first stretched upon the rack, and burned with heated hoops or plates of iron; he was then smeared all over with honey, placed with his hands bound around him in the burning sun; and thus left to putrefy and expire, exposed to the annoyances and stings of insects.'"[1]

The facts alleged in the extracts just given are confirmed by the great St. Basil, an almost cotemporary writer, in his funeral oration on the holy martyr Gordius. We subjoin the graphic picture of the Christian's sufferings drawn by this master-hand:

> "The houses of the Christians were wrecked and laid in ruins; their goods became the prey of rapine; their bodies of the ferocious lictors, who tore them like wild beasts, dragging their matrons by the hair along the streets, callous alike to the claims of pity of the aged, and of those still in tender years. The innocent were submitted to torments usually reserved only for the blackest criminals. The dungeons were crammed with the inmates of the Christian homes that now lay desolate; and the trackless deserts and the forest caves were crowded with fugitives whose only crime was the worship of Jesus Christ. In these dark times the son betrayed his father, the sire impeached his own offspring, the servant sought his master's property by denouncing him, the brother sought his brother's blood; for none of the claims or ties of humanity seemed any longer to be recognized, so completely had all been blinded, as if by a demoniac inspiration. Moreover, *the house of prayer was profaned by impious hands; most holy altars were overturned: nor was there any offering of the clean oblation of incense; no place was left for the divine mysteries;* — all was profound tribulation; a sable darkness that shut out all comfort; the sacerdotal colleges were dispersed; no synod or council could meet for terror of the slaughter that went on everywhere; but the demons celebrated their orgies, and polluted all things by the smoke and gore of their victims."

The persecution went on for ten long years; it raged with unabating fury throughout all the provinces of the Roman empire except Gaul and Britain; everywhere it stirred up popular commotions: everywhere the ruthless mobs burnt down the churches of the Christians; the whole empire was overspread with smoking ruins, and was reeking with Christian blood; and, after all this work of blood and desolation had been accomplished, the emperors erected monuments commemorative of their triumph, and of the final downfall and utter extirpation of Christianity from the face of the earth ![1]

---

[1] "Rome under Paganism," vol. ii, pp. 30, 31.

Vain and idle boasting of wicked men ! That religion which they thought they had already destroyed, was never in a more prosperous condition than it was at that very time : at the very moment that they thought they had extinguished its life, consigned it forever to the tomb, and erected its sepulchral monument, it was on the very eve of the great and final triumph ! Like its divine Author and Founder, it speedily arose from the tomb, filled with new life and radiant with new glory ! And, like its divine Founder, too, it arose to die no more ; its enemies were destined never again to enjoy even an *apparent* triumph over its pretended extinction. The blessed Jesus had remained in the tomb for three days : his church remained in the dark tomb of oppression and persecution for nearly three centuries : both were immortal and indestructible ; both triumphed over death.

The proudly boasting persecutors, trembling at the sight of their own iniquities, and bitterly remembering, like Antiochus of old, the evils they had done to the people of God, expired in the most excruciating agonies of both mind and body.[2] They died, and Christianity still lived ! They passed away and were forgotten ; and the religion which they thought they had destroyed, was seen emerging from the mountains, the wilderness, the caverns, and the catacombs ; it soon appeared again in public day, invested with renewed life and courage, and soon built up again its ruined temples ; and reared again its desecrated and overturned altars, in a style of richness and magnificence till then unknown. Its ministers put off the weeds of mourning, and put on the habiliments of joy. Public worship, till then chiefly confined to narrow chambers and dark caverns, now shone forth with all the dazzling splendor of a rich and magnificent ceremonial. The cross, trampled under foot for nearly three centuries, now appeared encircled with gems in the coronals of emperors and empresses, and was reared in triumph on the loftiest monuments of pagan Rome ! The inscription which had appeared on the mysterious heavenly cross seen by Constantine—*εν τουτω νικα*—"in this sign thou shalt conquer"—portended something more than a mere victory over Maxentius : it foreshadowed the speedy and final triumph of the cross of Christ over the multiplied abominations of heathenism. Christianity and paganism had grappled in a death-struggle for the mastery of the world ; and Christianity, with every odds against it, won the day and gained the ascendency. A poor fisherman, without riches, without talent, without influence, without any resources ; preaching a doctrine far elevated above the reason, and a morality at war with the most darling passions of mankind, had conquered that proud and haughty Rome, which had itself subdued and crushed the whole world with its iron scepter.

---

[1] One of the monuments, erected in honor of Diocletian, bore the boasting inscription : "*nomine Christianorum deleto*—The Christian name destroyed."

[2] See Lactantius, *De morte Persecutorum*.

What then availed all the persecutions that had been set in motion to crush the Christian religion? What availed all the vile slanders that had been circulated to destroy the character of Christians? What availed the unblushing forgeries that had been concocted for the same purpose? What availed the racks, the halters, the flesh-hooks, the gridirons and the crosses which had been employed? What availed the shouts of infuriate Mobs, and the ruins amidst which they had reveled with fiendish triumph? What availed all the combined exertions of earth and hell, of men and demons? All availed nothing. The church,

> "Strong as the rock of the ocean that stems
> A thousand wild waves on the shore,"

was impregnable and indestructible in the fortress which her divine Founder had erected for her, and in the panoply of divine strength which *He* had thrown around her! The "gates of hell" did not "prevail" against her, because *He* had predicted that they should *not* prevail!

But there is yet one other feature in the history of the early persecutors too remarkable in its nature, and too honorable to the character of the suffering Christians, to be omitted in this place. If Christianity triumphed over paganism, even while the latter was inflicting the most cruel torture and agony on the former, it triumphed, as its divine Founder had triumphed, by cherishing a spirit of unalterable meekness, of unruffled patience, and of sincere forgiveness towards its most bitter enemies. It repaid evil with good, curses with blessings, injuries and insults with prayers. Its numberless martyrs approached death with calmness, and with countenances beaming with heavenly joy. Not a complaint, not a murmur escaped their lips. St. Laurence was more tranquil while roasting on his gridiron, than his persecutors could have been, though reposing on beds of roses or of the softest down. The humble and helpless young virgin Agnes, while exposed to the taunts and insults of a brutal and licentious Mob, was more composed and happy than ever was the proudest matron of Rome, though glittering with jewels and leading the dance in a marble banquet room, surrounded by admiring hundreds. Nothing could ruffle the temper, nothing disturb the divine composure of the Christian martyrs. They died, freely forgiving, and fervently praying for those who were inflicting death on them!

The following fact, recorded with generous pride by Eusebius, will show that, even at the close of the fierce persecution under Diocletian, they not only retained no feelings of resentment or rancor against their enemies, but were disposed to return good for evil. At that period, a dreadful famine, followed by a still more dreadful pestilence, spread desolation through many rich and populous provinces of the Roman empire. "All places," says Eusebius, "were filled with lamentations,—in all streets, lanes, market places, and highways, nothing was to be seen but tears, with the accustomed flutes and funeral dirge." "Such," he adds, "were the rewards of the pompous boasting of Maximianus, and of his edicts throughout the cities against us!"

Then follows this testimony as to the generous and noble line of conduct pursued by the Christians on the occasion:

> "Then, also, the evidences of the zeal and piety of the Christians became manifest and obvious to all, for they were the only ones, in the midst of such distressing circumstances, that exhibited sympathy and humanity in their conduct. They continued the whole day, some in the care and burial of the dead, for numberless were they for whom there was none to care; others, collecting the multitude of those wasting away by the famine throughout the city, distributed bread among all. So that the fact was cried abroad, and men glorified the God of the Christians, constrained as they were by the facts to acknowledge that these were the only really pious, and the only real worshipers of God."[1]

We might institute a comparison, and easily establish an entire parallelism betwen the Mob spirit which attempted the destruction of the Church during the three first centuries, and that which has attempted the same object during the three last. A whole volume of evidence might be produced to prove that the reformation, *so called*, has employed against the Catholic Church the very same weapons which paganism of old employed against Christianity; and with about the same result. After three centuries of bitter denunciation, of studied and systematic misrepresentation, of atrocious calumny, of unblushing forgeries, and of maddening appeals to the worst passions of the ignorant and unprincipled, all threatening her with destruction, the Catholic Church is still as vigorous and as flourishing as ever, and the principle of life is still as strong in her as it was in her palmiest days: while her enemies, especially in Germany, have dropped, one by one, into the ranks of indifferentism, of rationalism, of deism, ignobly deserting the Christian cause, *she* has newly burnished up her armor, and has gone forth to battle against error and vice, with all the vigor of youth, and with the full assurance of that victory which has ever perched upon her banner!

To the American Catholic we would say that he has no reason whatever for discouragement or despondency on account of recent occurrences. The history of the past fully assures us, that a thousand such riots as those which have lately disgraced our country cannot materially injure, much less destroy, our Church. She bears a charmed life: though daily "doomed to death," yet is she "fated not to die." What do we now suffer which our forefathers, during the three first ages of the Church, did not suffer with a hundred-fold greater violence? If we are misrepresented and slandered, so were they. If we are assailed with "awful disclosures," so were they. If we are branded as aliens and enemies of our country, so were they. If our churches are burned and our altars desecrated by ruthless Mobs, so were theirs. If popular fury is constantly invoked against us, so it was against them. And if they were not cast down, so ought we not to be; for as surely as they triumphed, so surely shall we.

---

[1] Book ix, ch. viii, pp. 390-1. American translation.

Let us complete the parallel by imitating the meekness, the patience, the spirit of forgiveness which characterized our Catholic forefathers. Let us, like them, return good for evil, mild answers for railing, prayers for persecution. Our divine Lord has said: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall possess the land."

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

(Note A, P. 147.)

ON THE MAGNA CHARTA OF ENGLAND.

The controversy which was carried on between the English Barons and Pope Innocent III., and the Bull published by the Pontiff annulling the Charter, have been referred to, as conclusive evidence that the Catholic Church is opposed to liberty. The best refutation of this charge is found in a simple and unvarnished statement of the facts, as furnished by reliable historians. From these it will appear that the act of Innocent constitutes an exceptional case, easily explained by the circumstances accompanying it; that it was prompted chiefly by reasons extrinsic to the Charter itself; that his Bull had no practical results, even at the time it was issued; and that both his predecessors and his successors in the papal chair sanctioned, at least did not condemn, the political franchises contained in that famous instrument. Here are the facts, with the authorities by which they are supported:

1. The Charter was not a new document, drawn up for the first time by the Barons in 1215. It was more than a hundred years older, having been issued by Henry I., shortly after his accession to the throne in 1100. Cardinal Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, found this older document in the archives of London, and brought it to the notice of the Barons.[1] Many of its most valuable provisions were fifty years older, having been contained in the laws of Edward, the Confessor; some of them, as trial by jury, dated back to the reign of Alfred the Great, in the tenth century.

2. The Charter contained sixty-seven articles, most of them regarding special rights and immunities connected with the feudal system; and these have long since become obsolete, together with the peculiar system of jurisprudence of which they were an appendage. With the exception of the two provisions securing *habeas corpus*, and the right of representation before taxation, M. Hurter thinks that all the articles of the Charter may be reduced to two heads: "the guaranty of the requirements of natural justice, and the renewal of anterior rights."[2]

3. Though the Barons were in the right as to the substance of their demands, yet they more than once transgressed the bounds of moderation, notwithstanding the efforts of Cardinal Langton and the Bishops to restrain their impetuosity and to prevent violence. Thus, after John had signed the Charter, he called upon them in their turn "to subscribe the charters declaring that they were bound by oath and homage to be true to him against all manner of men, and to defend his rights and the rights of

---

[1] See Hurter — Histoire du Pape Innocent III. et des Ses Cotemprains, 8 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1838: Vol. iii, p. 824-5. This history is full, learned, and reliable, drawn from cotemporary authors. See also Lingard — History of England — John.

[2] Hurter, vol. iii, p. 381.

his heirs to the crown. They refused; and the archbishop, with several prelates, gave a solemn attestation of their refusal."[1] A portion of them went still farther, renewing the war against John, contrary to their solemn engagement, so lately entered into at Runnymede. "In many localities, the officers of the king were arrested or driven away, some royal possessions were ravaged, and the forests devastated."[2] The civil war having been thus rekindled in England, and John having ravaged the possessions of the Barons, they, after some hesitation, "unanimously determined to offer the crown to Louis, the eldest son of the king of France."[3] Thus, in a noble contest for liberty against a tyrant, the Barons greatly damaged their cause by violent measures, and by an attempt to upset the fundamental laws of the kingdom in calling a foreigner to the throne.

4. Perhaps a worse monarch than John never sat upon the English throne. Innocent had excommunicated him for his excesses, particularly for his sacrilegious oppression of the Church. He was as mean in adversity as he was cruel in prosperity. Finding that matters were going against him, and that his crown was in danger, he now professed repentance, took the cross as crusader, and placed himself as a vassal, his kingdom as a fief, under the special protection of the Holy See; thus becoming, of his own choice, a vassal of the Pope. The zeal of the royal penitent far outstripped the wishes of the Pontiff, who had not anticipated, nor expected any such result;[4] but, in accordance with the peculiar jurisprudence of that period, he did not feel himself at liberty to decline the trust thus reposed in the See of Peter, by a feeble prince beset with difficulties, and whom he believed sincere. It was not unusual for monarchs, during the middle ages, when surrounded by danger, to invoke the protection of "St. Peter" against violent assaults; and such appeals, far from depressing, tended rather to elevate the throne which sought so high a protector. Innocent was deceived by the wily representations of the English monarch, who found some plausible arguments in the violence of the Barons. The ambassadors of John found the Pope at Anagni; and they "spoke of the revolt of the Barons, of their exacting spirit, and of the declaration of the King, importing that that the Roman Church being the Suzerain of his kingdom, he could consent to nothing without its concurrence. The Barons," they added, "without regarding the appeal interposed, have occupied the capital by treachery, and have extorted by force of arms the liberties which they had demanded. They showed to the Pope the articles of the Charter, by which John thought himself most aggrieved. Innocent read them, rubbed his eye-brows, and said: 'Do the English Barons think to be able to overturn the throne of a king invested with the Cross, and who is under the protection of the Apostolic See, and put another in his place, contrary to the will of the Roman Church? . . . Such an injustice shall not go unpunished!'"[5]

5. In annulling the Charter, Innocent promised the Barons "that he would induce the King to consent to whatever might be just or reasonable, *to take care that all grievancies should be abolished, that the crown should be content with its just rights*, AND THE CLERGY AND PEOPLE SHOULD ENJOY THEIR ANCIENT LIBERTIES."[6] Thus, it is manifest, that the Pontiff did not condemn the Charter on account of the liberties it contained, most of which were ancient, long established, and sanctioned by Rome itself. His motives for the act, as stated by himself, were as follows; That John had become his vassal, and he felt bound by the jurisprudence of the

---

[1] Lingard — John — vol. iii, p. 59 — Edit. London, Dolman, 1844.

[2] Hurter, ibid., p. 335.

[3] Lingard, ibid., p. 64.

[4] Hurter, ibid., p. 285.

[5] Hurter, ibid., p. 337.

[6] Lingard, ibid., p. 62. He quotes Rymer.

times to protect him; that the Barons had employed violence, instead of accepting the offer of redress by due course of law; and that they had violated the privileges which all Christian nations had granted to the champions of the cross, in rebelling against John, an enrolled crusader.[1]

6. But did the act of Innocent really annul the Charter? Did the Barons recognize his right to do so? Did even the Bishops accept the decision of Innocent? They did not. They maintained that the rigorous measures adopted by Innocent "had been obtained on false suggestions, and for objects not within the jurisdiction of the Pontiff. He had no right to interfere in temporal concerns; the control of ecclesiastical matters only had been intrusted by Christ to Peter, and Peter's successors."[2]

7. Far from being practically annulled, the Charter was solemnly renewed and confirmed, under the express sanction of Honorius III., Innocent's successor, two years afterwards, in the reign of John's son, Henry III. This monarch ascended the throne in his eleventh year, inheriting from his father a disastrous and bloody civil war. "But Honorius, as feudal superior, declared himself the guardian of the orphan, and commanded Gualo (his legate in England) to reside near his person, watch over his safety, and protect his just rights. The legate discharged his trust with fidelity, and found in the earl marshal a coadjutor actuated by the same zeal and concurring in the same sentiments."[3] . . . . . "The Charter was again confirmed, but with additional alterations. It was provided that the widow should have for her dower the third part of all the lands which had belonged to her husband during the coverture, unless she had been endowed with a smaller portion at the door of the church. . . . . Lastly, it was enacted that ALL MEN SHOULD ENJOY EQUAL LIBERTIES."[4]

8. Between the year of its adoption and the date of the reformation, the Charter was confirmed no less than THIRTY-EIGHT TIMES: "Six times by Henry III., thrice by Edward I., fifteen times by Edward III., six times by Richard II., six times by Henry IV., once by Henry V., and once by Henry VI."[5] We do not read that any Roman Pontiff ever objected to even one of these numerous ratifications; some of these — as that under Henry III. referred to above,— were made with the express sanction of the Holy See.

9. From all these facts, it is apparent that the action of Innocent III. in regard to the Charter, together with his summary decision of the controversy between John and the Barons, constitute an exceptional case, involving other issues besides that of the franchises claimed by Cardinal Langton and his associates. To estimate aright the merits of the discussion, we should not lose sight of the peculiar system of jurisprudence which then obtained, on which the decision of Innocent was based. Whenever Roman Pontiffs were called on to interfere between a tyrannical prince and his subjects, during the middle ages, their influence was almost invariably thrown in the scale of popular rights and liberties. Such a thing as absolute monarchy, sustained by standing armies, was then wholly unknown; and subjects were thought to have rights as well as sovereigns. The doctrine of passive obedience had not yet been broached. Among the objects which induced Innocent III. to convene the general Council of Lateran, as set forth in his letter of convocation, we find the following: "to consolidate the faith, to extinguish enmities, to re-establish peace, to cause oppression to cease, *to protect liberty*, to determine princes and people to carry succor to the holy land, &c."[6]

---

[1] Lingard, ibid., p. 60.

[2] Lingard, ibid., p. 62. He quotes the original Latin of their reply, from Rymer and Mathew Paris.

[3] Lingard, ibid., p. 81.

[4] Ibid., p. 82.

[5] Ibid. p. 58, note.

[6] Hurter., ibid., p. 275 The letter of convocation was issued in 1213, and the council met in 1215

89094336518

b89094336518a

Date Due

DE 8 '71			
JA 5 '81			

Demco 38-297

89094336518

B89094336518A